DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 082 UD 021 677

AUTHOR Reese, William J.
TITLE Case Studies of Social Services in the Schools of Selected Cities. Final Report. Revised.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 81
CONTRACT 400-79-0018
NOTE 494p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

EDRS PRICE MF02/PC20 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Attitudes; *Community Involvement; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; Parent Participation; Political Issues; Social Action; *Social History; *Social Services; United States History; *Urban Education; Voluntary Agencies
IDENTIFIERS Missouri (Kansas City); New York (Rochester); Ohio (Toledo); Wisconsin (Milwaukee)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the delivery of social services in urban education in the light of the history of their origination, implementation, and significance. Explored are the educational reform movements in urban centers between 1840 and 1920, especially the period separating the depression of 1893 and the Palmer Raids of World War I. Attention focuses on four cities: Rochester, New York; Toledo, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Kansas City, Missouri. A case study analysis of these four cities evaluates the influence of both well known and obscure educational reformers by using a diverse range of sources which include newspaper reports, records of voluntary associations, and petitions to local school boards. The analysis identifies different political traditions, ethnic mixes, bureaucratic school arrangements, and industrial settings which contributed to the shape of new social service programs in different communities. The study attempts to discover the cause of the upsurge in interest in school reform at the turn of century, groups and community organizations that lobbied for change are identified. Also reviewed are attitudes of parents and children toward educational reform and how these changes affected their lives. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208082

CASE STUDIES OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN THE SCHOOLS OF SELECTED CITIES

William J. Reese

Final Report to National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C.

March 31, 1981

Contract No. 400-79-0018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD021677

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation entitled "Progressivism and the Grass Roots: Social Change and Urban Schooling, 1840-1920," which was completed in August, 1980, in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. My wife, Dianna, contributed directly to the completion of this project by spending many hours with me in archival catacombs searching for local historical documents. In particular she sacrificed several weekends during a hot Missouri summer at the Kansas City Public Library, where we jointly organized James M. Greenwood's papers. Through generous doses of love and tenderness, she enabled me to survive many trying days.

Carl Kaestle, my mentor, skillfully guided me through my graduate program at Madison and helped with further revisions of my dissertation. It is impossible to express fully my indebtedness. Carl always treated my sometimes bizarre ideas with respect, helped me clarify my thoughts, improve my style, and become a better historian. Time is often a most precious commodity, yet he shared his with me generously. So did all of my teachers and friends in Educational Policy Studies. The late Edward Krug, whose humility was as large as his understanding, encouraged me in my work at an early stage. Jurgen Herbst, Daniel Pekarsky, and Herbert Kliebard also helped me in special ways and added to my development as a writer, researcher, and teacher. Stanley Schultz of the History department and Michael Apple of Curriculum and Instruction stole time from their busy summer schedules and also contributed to the improvement of my ideas.

A number of fellow graduate students and friends at Madison helped me develop many of my ideas on the history of education. Mark Van Pelt in particular gave me his friendship, moral support, and constructive criticisms when they were most needed. Tom Anderson, Ann Bennison, Jonathon Burack, Carol Kean, John Rury, Ken Teitlebaum, and Jeff Wasserman did not always agree with my perspectives and conclusions about urban educational history, but they all helped me see the weaknesses and possible strengths in

my work. Despite all the aid of graduate students and professors, imperfections stubbornly remain in the final product. That I could not incorporate all of their best ideas into this study was my fault, not theirs.

A few of my undergraduate and graduate teachers also deserve special acknowledgement. James Rodechko, David Leach, Joel Berlatsky, and John Meyers of Wilkes College helped a working-class kid learn how to write and think in historical terms. David Roller, Richard Wright, William Rock, and Malcolm Campbell of Bowling Green State University provided an excellent environment for graduate study, and they supported me whenever the going became tough. Paul Yon, the chief archivist of the Center for Archival Research at Bowling Green, taught me the value of local history and the utility of different kinds of historical materials. David Thelen, my mentor for a year at the University of Missouri-Columbia, similarly helped me analyze reform movements in the Progressive era. I could never hope to answer all of his criticisms, but my attempts to do so deepened my historical understanding.

At a time of shrinking resources for graduate study, I was lucky to receive financial support for all of my graduate work. A Bernard C. Korn fellowship from the Milwaukee County Historical Society for 1979 was greatly appreciated. Also, the National Institute of Education generously provided two years of financial support. My project officer, Lana Muraskin, gave me total freedom in fashioning my own interpretation. Therefore, none of the opinions or interpretations expressed in this study should be construed as the official belief of either the Milwaukee County Historical Society or the N.I.E. Still, I would like to express my sincere thanks for their support of this study. For her conscientiousness and good cheer throughout the preparation of this lengthy manuscript, I would also like to express my deep appreciation to Diane Murray of the Department of Educational Studies at the University of Delaware.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
INTRODUCTION		v
Introduction To Part I		1
Chapter 1	Parental Deliverance And Childhood Salvation	4
Introduction To Part II		37
Chapter 2	Progress And Poverty	41
Chapter 3	A Joiner Of Clubs	62
Chapter 4	Brigands' Brains, Master Souls	99
Chapter 5	A "Better Class" Of Men	134
Introduction To Part III		164
Chapter 6	An Age Of Municipal Reform	168
Chapter 7	Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, And Educational Extension	215
Chapter 8	The Spirit Of The Little Red School House	251
Chapter 9	The School Health Movement	292
Chapter 10	World War I And The End Of An Era	328
FOOTNOTES		349
BIBLIOGRAPHY		458

INTRODUCTION

This study is primarily about the delivery of social services in urban education: a history of their origins, implementation, and significance. Between 1890 and 1920, America's urban schools gradually adopted numerous educational "experiments" that promised to transform the character of public education. Slowly and unpredictably, disparate voluntary associations of men and women in dozens of cities coalesced into movements for reform, pressing the schools to assume novel responsibilities. The distinction between public and private duties, so carefully articulated in previous years, soon lost its clarity. Confusion, uncertainty, and conflict over the purposes and scope of public education divided educators and laymen alike. With the schools seemingly gripped by unrelenting forces for change, contemporaries understood that educational policy makers had reached a crucial historical juncture.

The prospect of major change always produces contrasting public responses. Innovation sparks optimism in those searching for a better future but simultaneously deepens fears in others longing for an irretrievable past. By the 1890s, public educators like all Americans faced new problems and challenges: increased levels of urban growth, industrial transformation, and ethnic diversity. Although educational reform constituted only a single preoccupation of the period, there was striking interest in the neighborhood school after the depression of 1893, and this naturally shaped the course of social service reform. Men and women from diverse social, ethnic, and occupational backgrounds joined competing organizations devoted to educational change. However much these groups differed on specific means and ends, they all promoted the expansion of the social functions of education and the extension of public responsibilities into areas once considered private. Out of voluntary group agitation there emerged widespread and controversial innovations that later became familiar aspects of the common school.

Familiarity breeds more than contempt. It also undermines one's historical sensitivity. As Bernard Bailyn wrote, the historian's greatest challenge is to recognize that the past is "not incidentally but essentially different from the present" and that the paths to the present were often winding, unpredictable, and filled with impediments.[1] Few people in 1890 could have sketched the exact contours of urban education thirty years later, even though the central characteristics of twentieth century education slowly emerged amid the conflicts and debates of the Progressive era. It was a seminal period in the history of social service reform, and yet reform was never the simple unfolding of some comprehensive plan to remake the world of schooling. To impose clarity and design where none existed is to deny the complexity of human action and distort the lives of a generation of men, women, and children.

Educational reform was the product of community consensus and conflict on the importance of schooling and the nature of social change. Every American city possessed its own particular reform posture, its own blend of unique personalities and dominant individuals. All cities had community groups that agreed on the desirability of "reforming" the schools and yet strenuously disagreed on how this should be achieved. One thing was clear, beyond all the divisions among individuals that surfaced: the state, not the family, would become a more powerful source of social welfare. Whether Socialist or non-Socialist, club woman or union leader, reformers asked how rather than whether the state should intervene in children's lives. As the schools assumed new responsibilities, they increasingly grew in social significance and nurtured rising expectations among tax payers and community leaders.

Hence it is not surprising that by the 1920s America's urban school system seemed fundamentally unlike its former self. The schools had not only expanded in size but also in the complexity of services they offered to local communities. Many schools, for example, inaugurated programs to improve children's health. Medical inspectors, nurses, and dentists were added to the school staff, and the adoption of school breakfasts and lunches constituted another break from the past. Another private responsibility--children's recreation and summer activities--also became part of public regulation and scrutiny. By the turn of the century, local cities witnessed a full-blown movement for municipally funded vacation schools and school playgrounds. And then, in a popular movement that seemed to harken back to the days of the rural district school, activist citizens from all walks of life pressured school officials for social centers, to help make the neighborhood school the nucleus of neighborhood life and social and intellectual stimulation for young and old.[2]

To follow the sometimes tortuous, uncertain path of social service reform requires the reconstruction of the larger movements for educational change that reoriented mass instruction during the Progressive era. For the history of educational innovation and expansion is inexplicable apart from the context of the times and the renewed contemporary faith in the powers of schooling. In both theory and practice, urban schooling and youth policy changed rapidly during this period. Juvenile courts, for example, challenged the legitimacy of older responses to criminality and behaviorial deviance among youth. Similarly, as thousands of immigrant and native born poor clamored for more secondary instruction, leading policy makers altered the high school curriculum, retaining the academic and collegiate segments as elite preserves. Vocational pressures fragmented the curriculum as well as the social life of the common school, and it rested on alleged scientific advance as well as social prejudice. Guidance counselors employed I.Q. tests to place students in junior high school programs and thereby presumably fit students into appropriate academic slots.

Few aspects of urban schooling remained untouched during the Progressive period. Despite John Dewey's efforts, of course, most classroom instruction remained traditional: teachers mostly dispensed information and maintained order while children memorized their lessons and recited them in exchange for a grade. Authority and regimentation stayed constant, indeed flourished, in a new educational environment. Armed with a battery of charts, diagrams, and achievement scores, guidance officers determined which groups and classes of students shared particular classrooms. Besides such changes in bureaucratic procedures, the very character of formal school governance altered dramatically during the early twentieth century. The elimination of ward representation on school boards undermined neighborhood localism and enhanced the leadership potential of cosmopolitan urban elites: professionals, businessmen, manufacturers, elite women, and college professors and administrators. These individuals increased the power of superintendents (themselves schooled in the values of efficiency, scientific management, and Protestantism), and intensified conflict over school policy in local communities.

Social change was therefore an unmistakable feature of urban education in the early twentieth century. Whether one emphasizes the rise of curricular innovations, social service programs, or the nature of school governance, a large number of significant changes altered the character of schooling for millions of Americans. No one disputes the long range importance of "Progressive" reforms, but historians differ widely in assessing their origins and meaning. For liberal scholars like Lawrence Cremin, for example, social service reform was part of the larger "transformation of the school," a process of democratic and humane outpouring of reform sentiment in behalf of disadvantaged Americans.[3] To radical revisionists like Paul C. Violas, the character of reforms like playgrounds and lunches demonstrated that so-called altruistic reformers only wanted to oppress and control the children of working people.[4] In between these perspectives, readers can find a wide range of interpretations on the meaning and importance of various educational reforms during the Progressive era. Just as liberals have been criticized for their optimistic pronouncements on the relationship of schooling and human progress, so too have the revisionists been criticized for their sometimes simplistic, social control oriented models of political change and educational policy.

This history of the introduction of social services in schools at the turn of the century rejects the liberal position that educational change invariably produces humane results: clearly the origins and effects of any reform are more complex and ambiguous than that. At the same time, many recent histories based on social control theories also over-simplify the past. They often do so by focusing on the ideas and actions of elites, by excluding detailed examinations of outcast groups, and therefore by ignoring the dialectical nature of social change.

This study deals with the ideas, actions, and importance of the many men and women who participated in educational reform movements in urban education between 1840 and 1920. Most of the study involves the most significant years of the history of social service reform, the period separating the depression of 1893 and the Palmer raids of World War I. Focusing on four different cities, it evaluates the influence of some well-known social and educational reformers as well as more obscure individuals, people whose thoughts were generally recorded only in occasional newspaper reports, minute books of voluntary associations, and petitions to local school boards.

Uncovering the process by which urban school systems assumed additional social functions during the Progressive era is my principal concern. By studying innovation in different environments, I have tried to identify how different political traditions, ethnic mixes, bureaucratic school arrangements, and industrial settings contributed to the shape of new service programs in different communities. While looking for answers in different environments, I still have asked basically the same questions: Why was there such an upsurge of interest in school reform by the turn of the century? Specifically, which social groups and community organizations lobbied for which changes? How fundamentally different was the character of urban education in 1920, compared to three decades before? In particular, how widespread were various services that expanded the social role of public schooling, how willingly (and readily) did parents and children utilize these services, and what difference did they make in their lives?

Searching for the origins of social welfare programs in urban education in the early twentieth century requires discovering how social change occurs and ultimately affects institutions and their clientele. More than anything else, this involves explaining why so many diverse voluntary groups--women's organizations, parent associations, labor unions, Social Gospelers, and Populist and Socialist parties--once played such a seminal role in school innovation. Most histories of urban Progressivism still give considerable attention to the perspectives and actions of school board members, superintendents, and other educational elites. One cannot underestimate the importance of these individuals, but school innovation was a dynamic, interactive enterprise involving diverse and varied community groups. The extant records of the era that shed light on social change in education--whether trade union and Socialist newspapers or school documents or the manuscript collections of urban activists--reveal that reform was a very complicated phenomenon. Ideas on school reform burst forth from every conceivable corner of the community during the Progressive era. Even though every idea did not receive full attention or public approval, reform in its many expressions was more than simply a triumph of imposing elites or a victory by "the people."

Urban school reform in the Progressive era was an intricate process of accommodation between different community organizations and school leaders. Progressive reform did not simply flow downward from civic elites to the public, or outward from the schools to the community. Neither did it simply spring forth from below. In certain areas of innovation, the schools led the cause of reform. This clearly occurred, for example, in the dissemination and use of achievement and intelligence tests, which were formulated and perfected by school administrators and educators and gave "scientific" legitimacy to ability grouping, tracking, and reforms like the junior high school. In these and other areas, local citizens responded to the actions of the schools. Yet, in other spheres of reform, school leaders often lagged behind voluntary and lay groups agitating for change. Numerous service innovations like playgrounds, social centers, and penny lunches, for example, were initiated first by people outside of the school system, by men and women who were not formally trained educators but who nevertheless pressured officials for changes in school policy.

Local community groups were vital elements in the history of social service reform and social change generally in the Progressive era. Some voluntary associations had a diverse membership and eclectic interests; others had a narrower social base and confined outlook. At any rate, educational change cannot be completely understood without examining the composition and activities of groups like women's clubs, labor unions, radical political associations, parent-teacher associations, and other organizations that shaped public policy. Since social change in education in the Progressive era was often championed by these groups, their histories are central and not incidental aspects of the history of educational transfiguration. Whether organizations were comprised of liberal reformers or urban radicals, local Progressives viewed schooling as a leading instrument for social improvement. Since their visions of how to improve society often differed enormously, it guaranteed that conflict in many different forms characterized urban educational policy making in the early twentieth century.

Turn-of-the-century reformers who had diametrically opposed political and ideological perspectives--like radical Socialists and business efficiency advocates--often endorsed the same school innovations. Their reasons for doing so, of course, differed enormously, negating the quick assumption that everyone who endorsed the same program had identical intentions and motivations. To cite a single example illuminating this issue, Socialists were often the first organized body in Europe and the United States to endorse state funded meals for school children. American Socialists, like their counterparts abroad, endorsed school lunches to help compensate poor children for the unequal distribution of wealth caused by capitalism; it was a matter of social justice. Efficiency reformers, on the other hand, viewed the same programs as a form of capital investment, a way to build healthier and stronger citizens to defend and support the existing system. Which perspective predominated in the creation of innovations? Did new programs like social centers or health services fulfill the needs of one ideological interest group but not another? To what degree did innovations actually function as competing reform groups intended?

One strategy in assessing the origins, implementation, and significance of social service and Progressive school reforms is the use of detailed case studies of the "grass roots." Traditionally, the leading historians of American education have investigated schooling in a single geographical region: the Northeast. Currently the most influential urban educational histories, for example, examine Boston and New York. Moreover, the most significant comparative and state level studies of schooling are on Massachusetts. Long an innovator in educational development, the Northeast has properly had its full share of attention in shaping the history of American schooling. But because of this, large deficiencies exist in our understanding of education and social change in the Midwest, the South, and especially the Far West.[5]

My rationale in writing a multi-case history of significant school innovations in the Progressive era beyond just the East Coast is two-fold. In the first place, single case studies can sometimes reorient historical research. More often, they run the risk of becoming isolated from larger historiographical concerns and of generalizing widely on the basis of limited evidence. More comprehensive histories that cover a large number of cities, on the other hand, have tended to overlook regional differences, have downplayed educational diversity, and have insufficiently rooted local change in its immediate political and social context. This study hopefully offers a wider basis for generalization, since it explores more than one city and ranges outside of the urban Northeast. It simultaneously tries to situate local changes in the context of immediate as well as national developments.

The cities basic to this study are Rochester, New York; Toledo, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Kansas City, Missouri. These cities had their own distinctive political, economic, and social character. They also generated an enormous volume of relevant historical documents that provide the foundations to study nationally felt social changes in an in-depth and systematic way. Without driving the issue of historical "uniqueness" to an extreme, I hope to draw out both the unusual and representative features of these particular cities in the history of Progressive school reform. Choosing urban areas of different sizes, ethnic mixes, and political traditions help illuminate those factors that promoted the success or failure of particular reforms. Too often even today national policy makers presume that diverse urban areas can be serviced by uniform social programs.

Rochester, New York, has a prominent place in the history of Progressive era school reform, particularly in the area of social services. Rochester was the leading American city in the promotion of social centers, a popular innovation that many civic groups championed throughout the nation. Rochester's reputation flourished because of the activities and influence of Edward J. Ward, the so-called father of the social center movement. Ward became a national leader in social service expansion. Through his well publicized conflicts with local ward bosses, who vigorously opposed the social centers, Ward turned the national social center spotlight on his adopted city. In many regards, Rochester is uniquely suited to the study of social service innovations. Its reform leadership formed close bonds with civic activists in many cities. When the Socialist party assumed power in Milwaukee in 1910, for example, party leaders hired Ward as an advisor in social center development, and one of Ward's associates later operated Milwaukee's Socialist Sunday Schools.

Toledo, Ohio's significance during the Progressive era rested on fundamentally different grounds. Throughout the Progressive era, Toledo attracted national attention because of its famous mayors: the charismatic Samuel M. "Golden Rule" Jones (1897-1904), and his close friend and successor, Brand Whitlock (1905-1913). To contemporaries and later historians, both men symbolized a grass-roots expression of "social justice" in the early twentieth century. Indeed, Golden Rule Clubs formed across the country after Jones popularized his views on brotherly love and the Social Gospel. Jones and Whitlock pressed for many new social services in the schools, following and often furthering movements initiated by labor groups, women's clubs, and P.T.A.'s in child welfare reforms such as social centers, playgrounds, and penny lunches. After Jones' death in 1904, Whitlock became the acknowledged leader of the local Independent Movement, a third party effort that was central to Toledo politics until 1913. While the Republican Party dominated in Rochester (except for occasional challenges from upstart Socialists and liberal Good Government reformers), a vigorous variety of third party activism prospered in Toledo throughout the Progressive era.

Milwaukee provides another attractive city to study social change in the schools. Just as the attempts of Jones and Whitlock to establish a city of brotherly love brought Toledo its share of attention, so too did the activities of organized labor and the Socialist party make Milwaukee distinctive throughout the Progressive era. Like Toledo, Milwaukee had a large immigrant population. More than that, the Social Democratic Party, whose strength rested primarily on the local trade unions, captured the city administration in 1910, marking the first time that Socialists succeeded politically in a large American city. Compared to Toledo and Rochester, Milwaukee had a highly politicized and militant trade union movement. Formally aligned with the Socialist party, the trade unions agitated for many educational innovations and social service reforms. By electing their own members to the school board and cooperating with other civic groups, they became a remarkable and consistent force for reform rarely found in American cities during these years.

Compared to the political traditions and reform impulses in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee, Kansas City provides still another important setting for examining the history of school services. Unlike Milwaukee and Toledo, an entrenched two-party system firmly ruled the city and was never effectively challenged by any coalition of third-party dissidents. Even more so than in Rochester, the major political parties both reigned and ruled. Largely comprised of native-born citizens, the city lacked the ethnic cast of most Midwestern or Eastern cities. It therefore offers a unique opportunity to determine how a different population base influenced the shape of school policy. Kansas City's educational history also directly contrasts with these other three cities because its school board was already small and centralized by the 1870s. It underwent administrative centralization much earlier than most cities, producing a network of educational control unlike the systems found in nineteenth-century Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee.

In all of these cities as in much of the urban nation, educational innovation became an integral facet of Progressive reform. A wide range of individuals turned to the schools as a possible source of human betterment. In many respects educational innovation reflected the rise of a new social spirit in the 1890s and a widespread belief that the urban school should be a seminal force in the education and socialization of young people. Because of the school's perceived importance, men and women with many different political orientations sometimes competed and sometimes cooperated to realize their visions of educational and social improvement. School policy, the final product of community agitation, reflected pervasive and highly visible social conflicts which were themselves rooted in the class, ethnic, racial, and ideological differences separating school officials and competing voluntary interest groups. Hopefully, a detailed analysis of the process of decision-making in multi-urban settings illuminates the nature of these conflicts and reveals how they were expressed as policy in an era of educational reform.

Introduction To Part I

"In this country, to a more just sense and for a higher purpose than in any other, the youth are the property of the State."[1] Charles W. Hill, the perennial President of the Toledo school board, was rarely equivocal, and local newspaper reporters in 1855 eagerly reprinted such quotable statements. The twin belief that schooling was organized benevolence and that children were state property was never universally accepted in antebellum America. But it prevailed in the minds of those whose opinions mattered: Whig politicians and school reformers like Hill. Through their efforts the state actively intervened in schooling, drawing more and more children within its purview. By the mid-nineteenth century, the nation witnessed the proliferation of local and state institutions affecting the education, socialization, and control of youth: houses of refuge, orphan asylums and, except for groups like the American Indians and Southern black slaves, an expanding network of free, publicly financed schools.[2] If youth were not the property of the state, they were increasingly one of its special concerns.

The state did not by and large force children to attend schools in the nineteenth century. Local educational agencies, representing a vast, decentralized system of schooling across the nation, lacked sufficient means to compel attendance, though they admittedly shaped patterns of administrative control, pedagogical methods, and the curriculum. School enrollments rose dramatically in the century after the American Revolution, and numerous Americans by the time of the Civil War believed that education offered the best means for alleviating social distress and unifying the nation. "In the absence of effective state power to compel attendance," writes David B. Tyack, "this was mostly a voluntary social movement, the largest instance of decentralized institution-building in American history."[3] To prominent school reformers--those who would direct the course of educational innovation in local areas--public schooling was a grand social invention, representing the best interests of the state. Men like Charles W. Hill typically applauded the rise of state intervention in children's lives, acting as if "the state" and its evolving educational institutions represented everyone's interests. In fact, early urban school reform, like every other form of governmental action in the nineteenth century, was an expression of the particular class and social interests of the leading civic reformers in places like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City.

When various community organizations in local cities pressed for a wide range of Progressive social reforms in the 1890s, they encountered a school system and supporting political network fifty years in the making. The men and women who formed the backbone of grass-roots reform faced a world of established customs and institutional arrangements. Any study of turn-of-the-century school reform--which once again addressed fundamental questions of the state's role in children's welfare vis-a-vis the family--must therefore necessarily begin in the antebellum period. Only by following the social and intellectual contours of early school reform can one appreciate the new ground that was broken during the Progressive era, when the public schools assumed greater control over the medical, recreational, and general social welfare of young people. To comprehend why so many competing interests would struggle for mastery in the schools requires a recognition of the class and ideological dimensions of the history of the common school.

Nineteenth century school reformers were hardly the advance guard of the modern welfare state, and they should not be placed in this light. There was never any simple linear progression between past and present. Nevertheless, the leading antebellum school reformers in America's cities definitely involved the state in educational development in novel ways by extending and expanding its power. In that sense they constituted a link between past and present, for they set important precedents for even further state intervention in children's welfare. Nineteenth century school reformers extended the reach of colonial statutory precedents on the state's right to educate children and the more general notion of parens patriae, the state's role as parent to the child.[4] Most importantly, the creation of expansive school systems nationally testified to the heightened responsibility of local school agencies and, correspondingly, to the declining significance of the family in education. Popular conceptions of the relationship of the state to public welfare altered noticeably in response to widespread social changes in the antebellum years as well as in the Progressive era. Like all forms of governmental activity, educational policy emerged out of the struggles of those who held contrasting visions of education and the larger social order.

Parental Deliverance And Childhood Salvation

Our teachers often deeply feel the need of moral support in their arduous and perplexing labors. They need the sympathy of parents in frequently doing a work that belongs to the family and fireside. They have to contend with vices that have had their origin in the hovel and street; and how to make a youth love virtue and hate vice, learn habits of industry and hate idleness, whose course of training has all been the reverse of this--is the difficult task we demand of the teacher.

Milwaukee Board of Education, 1861

I

In the Spring of 1854, a ship chugged across Lake Erie with precious cargo for the citizens of Toledo. Although the town founders predicted that the city would be an international crossroads for trade, industry, and culture, the Propeller Toledo did not convey jasmine and lace or even glittering metals. Instead, the Toledo Blade announced the arrival of something far more useful to this bustling community: a 4,300 pound schoolhouse bell. The bell was soon placed in the tower of Toledo's expensive new high school along side a brass Town Clock, "which will strike the hours upon this ponderous bell, and announce the time to the inhabitants of the city and for miles around it."[1] With each dial spanning a diameter of seven feet, the clock became the capstone of the new school system, now less than a decade old. The school board appointed a "Keeper of the Town Clock" who later received extra compensation, as the Secretary of the board of education recorded in his minute book, "for keeping...all School Clocks in order."[2] With its usual flair for boosterism, the Blade saw in these events the unfolding of a new civilization; here were indisputable symbols of progress and improvement. And no institution would contribute more to the coming of this society than the local neighborhood school.

The preoccupation with clocks, whistles, and bells as public regulators of daily living was striking throughout the nineteenth century. Children in Toledo as elsewhere began and ended their school days with bells; if their parents were factory workers, they too understood the significance of morning and evening whistles. That clocks ticked incessantly in neighborhood schools marked the triumph of the values of those who led the movement for early school reform. For the men of affairs who laid the groundwork for the nation's urban school systems actively promoted many commercial and philanthropic projects: canals, plank roads, railroads, libraries, lyceums, and, when time allowed, public schools. In many respects the schools were one of the most difficult challenges confronting these builders of a new social order. There was considerable popular allegiance to the district system, which gave parents a strong voice in school affairs, and the majority of taxpayers and parents saw little need for change. But from the perspectives of new community leaders, that only meant that there would be more editorials to write, more meetings to attend, more frequent memorials to draft for the state legislature, lest the children of the community be condemned to a life of ignorance and immorality.

Between the 1840s and the 1860s, aggressive community leaders in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and then Kansas City more actively involved their municipalities in educational development. Systems of schools emerged on the urban frontier. Unlike a forthcoming generation of Progressives, however, these leaders did not believe that local government (or government at any level) should normally establish programs that, say, went beyond basic instruction and catered to the health or recreational needs of young people. However much the powers of the neighborhood school in producing virtuous citizens were extolled in private correspondence and public addresses, its actual scope was narrow compared to the future. However much school reformers both in the antebellum and Progressive eras, for example, stereotyped the poor and foreign born as dirty, unkempt, and unhealthy--somehow physically unfit for the common schools--the Progressives alone had the legal and public sanctions to ameliorate these dilemmas through social service programs. And yet the antebellum reformers had set new educational wheels in motion, propelling the state forward as a more powerful force in the education and socialization of youth.

Despite the claims of many local historians, the school systems that emerged in antebellum Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City were not the result of some movement for American "democracy." Put simply, school reformers were intensive, energetic, and acquisitive individuals who had broad visions of commercial and later industrial empire. Their biographers, usually close friends, approvingly called them "capitalists." The characterization fits the subjects well. Endorsing the principle of state intervention in schooling and in the political economy, local school reformers were usually Whigs and almost always town boosters as they fought for tax-supported systems of education.[3] They continually cajoled contented parents and suspicious taxpayers, urging support for their righteous cause. Despite these efforts, the plain people or local mechanics never rose up to demand new systems of state-supported education for their children. Instead, elite members of the professional, economic, and social classes controlled the timing and pace of educational innovation.[4]

Newspaper men in city after city boosted the cause of school reform and social transformation. They welded programs of state intervention in schooling with dynamic schemes of internal economic improvement, shaping as well as reflecting the desires of an emerging civic elite. Personalities differed somewhat from place to place and Democrats often aided the effort, but everyone held buoyant visions of the future of school and society. Henry O'Reilly, an Irish immigrant who edited Rochester's first newspaper in 1826, exemplified the spirit of urban boosterism. Most notably, he pressed for numerous economic and civic improvements from the expansion of the nearby Erie Canal to the replacement of district schooling with a comprehensive and centralized system of education. This editor, banker, and later inventor agitated for many of the citizens' meetings which considered the establishment of a school board in the early 1840s, when Rochester's population already surpassed twenty thousand. Like many contemporaries, O'Reilly feared that vice, crime, and sedition would proliferate without systematic efforts to combat them.[5]

In Toledo, the Whig and later Republican Blade, founded as a tri-weekly in 1847, similarly agitated for a full system of public improvements. One favorite idea was the linkage of the Wabash Canal in the hinterland with the Erie Canal to the East through the shipping lanes of the Great Lakes. Hosmer Graham, the Blade's editor, characteristically wrote that "in this age of improvements, this great, and all important subject of educating the whole people, the masses, should not be lost sight of nor neglected." For although his city still possessed fewer than four thousand inhabitants, he realized that canals and the iron bands of the railroads would soon integrate enterprising communities into national markets. And certainly the nation's expansive plans of "Internal Improvement" seemed incomplete without a corresponding network of education.[6]

The rise of urban school systems was largely the result of the activities of these advocates of internal economic and social development. Already by the 1820s Rochester was heralded not as the next Syracuse or Utica but as the future Pittsburgh or Cincinnati. Toledo's boosters similarly hoped that sound business leadership would transform the area's "high, isolated banks of clay, and muddy, busty ravines" into the nucleus of a "large commercial city."[7] Lofty expansionist dreams, based primarily on economic development, prevailed in every aspiring metropolis. The Democratic press of different cities gloried in the coming of the American imperium, but Whigs in particular set the ideology of social and economic expansion into full motion. The Milwaukee Sentinel, for example, assured its small community in 1845 that the area was "destined to be the chief commercial and manufacturing city of this WESTERN EMPIRE."[8] Like Henry O'Reilly, his Rochester counterpart, Rufus King of the Sentinel was an early member of the local school board and an avid promoter and civic booster; King was also Milwaukee's first school superintendent. A member of the Wisconsin Constitutional Convention in 1847, he enjoyed state-wide political influence and became a regent of the University of Wisconsin.[9]

Decades after urban school systems began in New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin, Robert T. Van Horn's inspirational editorials for Kansas City's Whig and later Republican newspapers made all of these men seem like amateurs. That the "city" had approximately four thousand residents in 1860 mattered little. By mid-decade Van Horn and the community business leaders that lured him to the bend of the Missouri River were trumpeting the virtues of their promised land. An itinerant printer with an undistinguished past, the editor was well suited to become one of the West's leading civic promoters and champions of schooling. He worked as a young man on the Erie Canal, where he learned of internal improvement first hand. Soon after Van Horn rightly predicted that the nation was on the brink of vast commercial expansion.

Like the famous William Gilpin of Independence, Van Horn labored to dispel the common characterization of the West as a Great American Desert. Instead, he perceived an American version of the Garden of Eden, one filled with national and international markets supported by a vast system of railroads crisscrossing his fair city. But the American paradise required more than trains and banks, buyers and sellers. "Here will soon be the commercial center of a vast and energetic population," Van Horn acknowledged in the Kansas City Journal of Commerce in 1869, "and it is proper that the means of education, scientific and literary, should keep pace with the progress of material wealth and advancement."[10] Education was the handmaiden of economic development, and as a result of his clear and bountiful vision, many historians of Kansas City naturally emphasize the remarkable influence of this famous booster on school reform.[11]

Boosters were not above misrepresenting the state of education in local communities. When it came to mass instruction, they condemned district schooling and most forms of private initiative in education. In their eyes, district schools were as ineffective in educating the people as the pay schools, select schools, and the itinerant school master. The whole method of educating children was too irregular, too informal, and too often subject to parental discretion: parents determined how, when, and whether their offspring would be educated and schooled. Too much seemed left to chance to those who equated parental choice with social chaos and disorder. Like every editor who prayed for metropolitan status, Van Horn complained in 1867 that Kansas City lagged behind other urban areas in educational progress. He even claimed that there were no schools in the city, ignoring the existence of some district schools and a variety of private institutions. Nevertheless, Van Horn warned that children languished in an atmosphere of vice and ignorance: "We can furnish them billiards and whiskey, but we have no public schools."[12]

In Toledo, the superintendent of schools further claimed that before centralization the "schools were 'without form and void,' and the private schools were so private as scarcely to be known even by the man who took the census; or to be found in the memory of 'the oldest inhabitant.'"[13] Toledo must have had an incredibly inept census worker, and lack of evidence made the superintendent's position 'without substance and void.' Still, editors repeatedly emphasized that internal improvement plans would be undermined unless parents abandoned the existing educational arrangements. But parents seemed lethargic and resistant to change; they refused to be delivered from the burdens of controlling their children's education. Naturally perverse, they looked to the past instead of the future. And so newspaper writers in city after city called for "citizens' meetings" to rally people behind a more centralized and directed system of education, in line with the march of commercial and economic progress. These meetings testify to the elite origins of mass education.

Historians of these four cities have described the men who lobbied for centralized schooling in many ways: they were "civic minded" elites, "public minded" citizens, and urban statesmen.[14] Perhaps they were all of these. Contemporaries, however, more accurately described them as "men of affairs," a literal phrase signifying one's membership in a select economic or social group that shaped general urban development. Citizens' meetings which promoted the establishment of school systems were not attended by a cross-section of the community, but by emerging or newly-established community leaders. These men were dominant civic leaders active in all spheres of urban politics, and they certainly were unrepresentative of the lower classes. Blake McKelvey, for example, has demonstrated that Henry O'Reilly and other enterprising commercial and professional interests led the march against the district system in Rochester. I. F. Mack, a prominent Whig and custom miller in a city whose prosperity considerably rested on flour production and trade, served as the city's first school superintendent in the early 1840s, testifying to the connections between commercial development and educational change. However much the local Workingman's Advocate encouraged the working classes to pay more attention to their children's formal education, there is no evidence that they initiated early school reform.[15]

In Toledo, the citizens responsible for school reform in the 1840s were also highly select individuals. Prominent among them was Charles W. Hill, a Whig politician, plank road promoter, attorney, and City Clerk in the 1830s who subsequently served as the President of the school board for decades. Another Whig and advocate of state intervention in education, Daniel Swift, was locally renowned as the contractor behind area canal construction. Edward Bissell, who joined them in Toledo's citizens' meetings, built the first mill in the city (still called the "Corn City" for its corn processing, compared to Rochester's reputation as the "Flour City"); otherwise he was active in harbor improvements, railroad development, and land speculation. Dennison Steel, a Democrat until he joined the Republican ranks in 1854, was an attorney, a commission merchant, and a council member in the 1840s, besides having investments in lumbering and ship building. Along with other mercantile interests, these men were the acknowledged founders of Toledo's emerging school system.[16]

Similarly, civic elites concerned with comprehensive internal improvement laid the foundations of Milwaukee's schools. When school related meetings were organized by Rufus King and the _Sentinel_ staff in 1845, Dr. Lemuel W. Weeks took command of a movement that included the major professional and economic interests in the new city. Like King a Yankee by birth, Weeks was a promoter of improved harbors and railroad development, a pioneer merchant in the grain trade, and a real estate speculator. An admiring friend and biographer recalled that he was "fond of making money, and as fond of spending it," and was "one of the most industrious men that ever lived in Milwaukee."[17] The inner circle also included another Yankee, Increase Lapham, whose national reputation as a scientist was exceeded only by his local contributions as an urban booster. Lapham's father was one of the contractors for the Erie Canal, and young Weeks subsequently became prominent in the construction of Ohio's network of inland waterways in the 1830s. After his arrival in Milwaukee in 1836, he accumulated considerable property and prestige. The men who built the local schools were not all native born, however; this famous city of immigrants also produced prominent ethnic leaders as well. Moritz Schoeffler, the Democratic owner and editor of the first German newspaper in the city, the Wiskonsin-Demokrat, and Richard Murphy, a leading Irish politician, were also influential in framing the early school laws through these citizens' meetings. Whether foreign born or native, elite leaders overcame public indifference and opposition and inaugurated a new educational order.[18]

Despite Milwaukee's later Socialist trade union reputation, local mechanics and laborers were not visible elements in the establishment of a unified system of schools in 1846. The age of regular trade union involvement in school reform in these cities still lay in the future. Similarly, the architects of Kansas City's schools in the 1860s included the famous Van Horn, William Sheffield, a leading attorney and civic promoter, and some of the most influential bankers and merchants in this boom town. It is therefore understandable that in 1869 John Phillips, Kansas City's first school superintendent, specially thanked "our leading citizens" for their help in advancing the cause of reform.[19] These men guided the pace of change and the shape of schooling in their new city.

School superintendents, school board members, and other nineteenth-century educators adopted the booster spirit as their own. They saw economic development as desirable and spoke of population growth and additional school buildings as enthusiastically as boards of commerce applauded an increase in trade. They publicized the positive connections between economic prosperity and educational growth, and never as an afterthought. President S. L. Rood of the Milwaukee board of education commonly noted in 1849 that a sound system of education attracted the "better class" of immigrants who would stimulate commercial enterprise. Urging the construction of more school houses, he wrote: "To the question so often asked by persons upon their visit to our city, 'What is the state of education among you?' a more satisfactory answer must be given than can now be done, if we wish our city to continue to prosper and flourish."[20]

President Charles W. Hill of the Toledo school board echoed these sentiments in 1855, affirming the connections school promoters perceived between education and commercial prosperity. When his administration was attacked for mismanagement and for squandering tax dollars on palatial school buildings, he simply responded that the school board "should be held responsible for a large per cent. of the increased population bro't to your town and the enhanced value of your town property."[21] A booster sheet for Kansas City argued in 1879 that families with school age children would love the area for its schools and commercial prospects: "Here you will find good schools, and, at the same time, not be shut off from business opportunities."[22] Was it not true, according to the Democratic Times, that Kansas City was "the queen and imperial mistress of the West"? Or, as J.V.C. Karnes, one of the city's leading attorneys and a powerful school board member, asserted in his Presidential address in 1880: "Every year is an improvement on the previous one. Our educational growth is keeping pace with our commercial."[23]

School representatives, therefore, commonly equated rising school enrollments with regional economic development. During the early years of these school systems--roughly between the 1840s and the 1880s for most of these cities--commerce and trade formed the linchpins of the local economies. The commercialization of agriculture, along with the construction of canals and then railroads to transport goods and finished products to various markets, enabled local cities to exploit their unique geographical position. This fostered the growth of an interdependent, national economy. Large-scale industrial capitalist enterprise did not develop very rapidly until long after these four school systems were already established. Early school reform was not the product of factory development but the result of agitation by mostly pre-industrial commercial, professional, and civic elites whose successes laid the basis for later industrial expansion. By 1880, however, manufacturing became increasingly integral to these local economies. By then Kansas City already had $2.1 million invested in manufacturing establishments, compared to $5.5 million for Toledo, $13.1 million for Rochester, and $18.7 million for Milwaukee.[24]

7

The conservative aims of the urban elites who constructed these school systems are easily documented. Proving their ubiquitous claims that educating and socializing the masses led to commercial advancement and economic growth is far more difficult. Certainly educational boosters at the time believed that schooling had positive social effects. The schools became a valuable way to inculcate social beliefs that supported political stability and the established order. The schools were quite explicitly perceived as a handmaiden of economic growth and the best possible solution to the immorality of the street and the problems of parents and children who needed discipline and uplift. The Kansas City Times simply restated the conventional wisdom in 1879 by asserting that "the idea is kept prominently in view that the object of the school is to prepare the children for the duties of citizenship, and to make them law abiding and wealth producing citizens."[25]

The establishment of a system of urban schools was one tangible accomplishment of mid-nineteenth century boosterism. The irregular, unpredictable, and unsystematic quality of education earlier was discredited, new formal governing structures were erected, and the idea of a single, tax-supported network of schooling gained political legitimacy. Yet history is not simply a tale of how dominant interests run roughshod over everything in their path; it is rather the product of the interaction between competing forces and ideas. Although they often acted from a less favored position of power than elite boosters, parents and children reacted against some of the dominant trends in the Gilded Age school and accordingly tried to shape institutions at least partially to their own personal and cultural ends. Their struggles are as much a part of the history of urban education as those of wealthier citizens who more powerfully directed social transformation.

Some parents, especially Catholics, preferred using their own meager funds to operate two systems of education rather than to submit to the public schools. And it was easier to purchase a clock than to make everyone march to the school house door on time, easier to proclaim the need to inculcate virtue in youth than to be certain of success, easier to speak of rising enrollments as unqualified human

31

progress than to acknowledge that large numbers of parents and children dissented from specific aspects of the new system. Beneath the outspoken boosterism of the school and community leaders lay the uneasy recognition that conflict was a potential and often daily occurrence in the neighborhood school. All this proved that every dominant historical action provoked an opposite if not equally powerful reaction.

II

Urban parents and their children were the major impediments in the schoolmen's quest for rationality and clock-like order in the nineteenth century. And yet the schools by all indices of growth assumed greater social and educational significance. Children spent more time in these tax-supported institutions, and countless Americans celebrated the role of schooling in social reform and national development. The yawning gap between aspirations and realities soon checked this unbridled optimism: neither crime nor poverty disappeared, as school boosters promised, and many parents rejected the notion that their children were state property. Conflict between home and school became acute. If parents were the natural guardians of their children, as so many people claimed, what right did the state have to interfere in family relations? How did one determine where parental responsibilities began and those of the school teacher ended? Contemporaries invoked the legal concept of _in loco parentis_, which added to the power of the school but which never fully specified which rights teachers could legally and reasonably appropriate from parents.

In 1877 the editor of the popular _New England Journal of Education_ addressed this central issue like so many other writers in contemporary educational journals. Arguing first that parents were indisputably the natural guardians of their children, he asserted that they currently had neither "the capacity, the time, nor the appliances needed for the right education of the child." This was not unfortunate, however, since a well trained teacher was "the parent's deliverance and the children's salvation."[26] Few school leaders or civic boosters in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas

City challenged this basic assumption on the meaning of public education. Parents were repeatedly attacked as immoral, indifferent, and a hindrance to the perfection of local school systems. Their children arrived at school too late, too infrequently, too much in need of character training. Given the prevailing attitudes of those who proclaimed the virtues of the clock and of commercial progress, it is not surprising that numerous conflicts emerged between home and school in the pre-1890s.

Punctuality, discipline, graded schooling, uniform instruction, centralization, and moral training were integral aspects of early school reform. Their application nurtured deep antagonisms between the emerging system and parents. This is not to suggest that parents and teachers engaged in daily battles over important pedagogical issues, for that was never the case. A wide gulf nevertheless separated school promoters and certain educational clientele. In dozens of school reports generated in these cities, superintendents, principals, and leading school commissioners repeatedly publicized the tremendous moral and intellectual accomplishments of the schools, in contrast to the failings of parents and their children. They devoted numerous paragraphs to the children "of poverty and crime," to the "dangerous classes," and to the "embryo mob or hoodlum element" roaming the city streets. In Ohio the immigrant and native poor were maligned for their alleged ignorance and immorality. "These are the persons who are most likely to frequent the race-course, the circus and the grog-shop; who disturb towns and neighborhoods with their midnight yells; and who subsequently become thieves, pickpockets, incendiaries, or the leaders of mobs, and finally die in the gutter, the almshouse or the prison."[27] Nevertheless, educational leaders repeatedly claimed that children with "vicious habits" could be redeemed through the power of schooling.[28]

Public school systems did not evolve without visible opposition and dissent. The schools in these four cities emerged at a time when many parents and citizens were loyal to district schooling as well as uncertain about the benefits of a city-wide school board and graded and uniform education. The Toledo Blade complained in 1849 that parents seemed either indifferent or antagonistic toward the Akron Law (1846), which provided for an elected board of education and a graded plan of schooling for many Ohio cities.[29] Home and school antagonisms were also registered in Rochester's early school reports, which described a residue of grumbling and complaint by the citizenry long after the district system was dismantled in the 1840s.[30] Whig editors in Milwaukee and Kansas City bluntly explained that in this inhospitable atmosphere elite leaders had to take the lead in school reform. When the Sentinel staff discovered high adult illiteracy rates in 1845, the editor quickly blamed them on public apathy. "What are the friends of education doing?" he asked. "Where are the schools wherein are to be educated the children and youth of Wisconsin?...There is a criminal apathy upon this subject."[31] Van Horn of Kansas City similarly complained a few years later that "not one-twentieth [of the citizenry] have an intelligent idea of the condition of things, and not one-fiftieth can be induced to attend any meeting."[32]

Van Horn and his peers accurately described the lack of popular enthusiasm for their "citizens' meetings" but nevertheless furthered the questionable position that only school boosters possessed worthy ideas on education. Once schools were formed under the auspices of local elites, school boosters habitually treated legitimate parental concerns with the nature of their children's education as signs of meddling, interference, and ignorance. The likelihood of social and cultural conflict quickly accelerated. The annual rise in enrollment rates demonstrated that parents valued the education and training their children received in school; however, they refused to toe the line on every issue or timidly withdraw from their children's education. A consensus on the value of education for children never signified any consensus on the nature and content of school instruction. Moreover, conflict was encouraged by the dependent status continually accorded to parents by the schools. Parents were told to visit the schools, but only if they did so cheerfully, without malice, in full support of whatever transpired in the classroom; they were told to have their children in place for the nine o'clock bell, even if that proved difficult; and more than anything else, they were told to cooperate, not to join teachers as equal partners, but to cooperate.

Pleas for parental cooperation filled school reports during the nineteenth century. Parents were supposed to "cheer and encourage" the teachers in their arduous labors; they were expected to demonstrate "an appreciative spirit," and never to engage in "unkind criticism or ungenerous suspicion."[33] Like April showers, parents were supposed to freshen and invigorate the atmosphere. Dark clouds always intruded, however, since apathy or conflict always seemed to predominate. I. F. Mack, the Whig superintendent of Rochester's schools in the 1840s, typically asserted that "one of the most discouraging circumstances that has thus far existed... is the inertia of parents, or want of parental interest."[34] School officials continually complained that parents rarely visited the teacher; rather, "the child is sent away to receive an intellectual fashioning, and the place where this is done, is rarely, if ever, visited."[35] Rochester's school board President in 1862 angrily denounced the "criminal neglect and indifference of parents and guardians in respect to the education of their children."[36] In the 1880s the Committee on Teachers in Rochester, which handled citizen complaints, asserted that much of its "onerous and unpleasant work" would be eliminated if parents took the time to visit their children's instructors.[37]

Leading urban newspapers rallied behind the evolving school systems and demanded consensus between home and school. They continually urged parents to visit the classroom, attend exhibitions, and witness the annual recitations and examinations. The Toledo Blade, however, stated in 1853 that the failure of parents to do so "has been a source of no little discouragement to the Board of Education and the Teachers."[38] Morale was so low that the leading pedagogues published a monthly magazine called The Teacher, expressly designed "to keep alive the interest of our citizens in the Schools, and keep them reminded of their progress and condition."[39] The lead article in its first volume in 1854 denounced parents for their failure to visit teachers and children for their tardiness--a curious way to build public support but proof of the perceived absence of home and school amity. The common assertion that "'Parents should visit the schools' is trite," wrote Toledo's school superintendent in 1888. "Few of them do so. Many of them have no personal acquaintance with the teacher who instructs their children and very often do not even know her name. Parents will study the credentials, the disposition, and capabilities of one who is to cook their food, keep their books, or manage the horses. The soup might be spoiled, the accounts mixed, the horses ruined!"[40] For teachers they unfortunately cared little.

Numerous tales of parental apathy in school visitation and various descriptions of home and school antagonisms enlivened the sometimes dry school reports of the nineteenth century. They revealed the everyday forms of conflict and suspicion that often characterized home and school relations. Educational leaders continually underscored the benevolent mission of the public schools and the baneful influence of meddling and muddle-headed parents. Meddlers ignored the elementary fact that teachers in parent-like fashion made the schools like "a happy home" and that the state was really as tender and caring as any loving mother or guardian. The assertion that schools were really homes and that the state represented general parental interests was undoubtedly incorrect but expressed the dominant ideals of early school reform. Moreover, as a Milwaukeean asserted in the local School Monthly, whether one accepted these arguments was immaterial, since "the right of the state over the child is, in a measure, paramount to that of the parent," no matter what objecting parents believed.[41]

Educational reformers believed that widespread parental apathy toward school visitation and other sources of conflict only provoked misunderstandings between home and school, a situation harmful to good schooling and all very needless. When parents and teachers remained total strangers, two major problems were thought to result: children lied whenever they were offered the chance, and parents condoned non-attendance and tardiness for trivial reasons. Rochester parents were often accused of accepting uncritically the "garbled statements of their children, and condemn[ing] the teacher unheard.... Children are often roguish and lawyer-like in their stories; and parents, without investigation, decide upon ex parte testimony. In this way the child lights the flame, the parent fans it, and often great mischief is done."[42] Quarrels between parents and teachers invariably ensued. The phrase 'She has a grudge against my boy' was constantly pressed into service by parents, according to Toledo's superintendent, who said that they were usually ignorant of the facts in school disputes.[43] Elsewhere it was alleged that "if some parents were aware how much deception is practiced by their children, as soon as they are able to write, they would be greatly alarmed."[44]

The most tender aspect of parent-teacher relations was associated with punctuality, attendance, and school discipline. Clock-like regimen was encouraged not only through the sounds emitted from two ton bells but also by the way in which school officials gathered elaborate monthly statistics on school attendance. Rochester published detailed charts on the number of hours of education children lost through tardiness and absence; the handwritten minute books of the Toledo board of education are replete with orders for more clocks and bells; and the Secretary of the Kansas City school board was instructed in 1882 not only to ensure that all school clocks functioned properly but also to synchronize time in every school.[45] If parents might be delivered from the difficulties of educating their children, saving youth from lives of crime and immorality, the schools should at least do it punctually!

The statistics on attendance and punctuality for the period reveal that the majority of parents complied with the rules. The actions of a non-compliant minority still offended most superintendents, whose school reports overflowed with decimal points on tardiness and accusations of parental insubordination. School officials routinely condemned parents for their lax habits. E. V. DeGraff of Grammar School No. 5 in Rochester, for example, published some delightful examples of excuses parents sent him in 1867 on their children's deportment. In accounting for their children's tardiness or absence, parents gave DeGraff such excuses as "Had to run an errand," "Went to the drug store," "Was minding baby," "Had to watch for a thief," and that most questionable of all reasons: "Clock stopped."[46] Principal DeGraff's dissatisfaction was echoed elsewhere. A survey of Kansas City's principals a decade later underscored their open antagonisms toward parents; nearly every report on local conditions condemned parents for their harebrained excuses for tardy offspring. However, at least the parents of Helen Kahn, Lottie Halo, Ada Pratt, Guy Allen, and Maggie Burke could rejoice, since their children had attained that enviable mark of distinction: perfect deportment.[47] But for every Maggie Burke there were countless second and third offenders.

James M. Greenwood, whose superintendency in Kansas City ranged from 1874 to his death in 1914, only expected the school system to instill discipline in children similar to the kind he expected of himself. His life was a testimony to the power of time discipline. A close friend of Robert T. Van Horn, a confidant of the bankers, lawyers, and other men of affairs on the school board, and an opponent of fads and frills in education, Greenwood merged a rural background which stressed hard work and application with the rhythms of commercial life found in this boom town. He appeared at his office promptly each morning at seven o'clock, parsed Latin verbs, read Greek, and within two hours punctually began a full schedule of school administration. He did this until the day he died, which occurred appropriately enough at his office, with a book clutched firmly in hand.[48]

Greenwood claimed that his upbringing on Illinois and Missouri farms taught him "to work systematically, quietly, promptly, and rapidly; also to get to bed early and to get up early. To make few promises, to obey the laws, and to pay what I owed."[49] In 1876 he required all parents to send a written excuse to the teacher every time a child was tardy or absent. When parents protested, he attacked those "who have not stopped to consider the importance which the world attaches to promptness and regularity in matters of business." Like so many school leaders and urban boosters, "business" success was his touchstone. "The vacillating, slip-shod, go-easy soul is neither respected, loved or feared," he added. "He is a nobody, and should be sent back to nature's mint and be recoined."[50] Economy of time, he always said, was nature's first law.

School leaders like Greenwood therefore emphasized the need for school discipline and regularity because of the connections they perceived between the life of the classroom and the larger society. In 1882, Superintendent John Dowd of Toledo made this perfectly clear:

> The boy who is found promptly in his place at school for five days in the week, for forty weeks in the year, through a period of from four to seven years, will always be found, when he is through with his school life, at the appointed place, at the appointed time, for the appointed business. He has formed the habit of being on time.[51]

Discipline was also required because of the large size of classes, especially in the lower grades. Average class sizes of over sixty pupils were not uncommon in these cities; some classes occasionally reported over a hundred children cramped into very small spaces. One investigation in a German neighborhood in Kansas City in 1881 uncovered "160 children packed like sardines in a box" in one primary class.[52] In these situations, where distractions to scholars abounded, self-control, punctuality, and adherence to rules and regulations helped secure social order. So did corporal punishment, even though its indiscriminate use sometimes led to parental dissent. But when moral suasion failed, as it often did, whipping seemed justified and preferable to chaos.

One overworked school marm described her philosophy for the Kansas City Mail in the early 1890s with the simple rhyme, "The big ones I thrash, the small ones I mash."[53] It was always presumably done in the best interests of the child and moral order. Some parents probably gave their children thrashings which exceeded those of the school marms; occasionally, however, angry parents hauled the teacher to court for what they termed undue abuse of their children. Every city had its locally famous incidents in which parents assaulted teachers, teachers returned the favor, and children were beaten by both; it all made tremendous news. Most teachers nevertheless expected and received the support of the school board if an obstreperous lad received his comeuppance.[54]

Few school leaders ever seriously entertained thoughts of abolishing corporal punishment during these years. Although it provoked considerable conflict at times between home and school, corporal punishment best demonstrated the school's ability to control the behavior of children. Those who urged its abolishment were like voices in the wilderness. Superintendent Greenwood gave parents the option to discipline their own children, or let teachers do it for them, but corporal punishment was still liberally employed in Kansas City in the 1890s. This does not mean that teachers in these cities had an insatiable desire to beat children; very often the majority of discipline cases were directed against a limited number of children and performed most systematically by a select group of teachers.[55] Yet the power of the rod was always reserved for the teacher's use as a last resort to ensure order. In Rochester, Superintendent S. A. Ellis in the 1870s scoffed at "sugar plum" theories of child governance, calling them utopian. He proudly asserted that many wild "street Arabs" were tamed by the snap of the rattan. In his opinion licking made learning more likely.[56]

According to school officials, therefore, many parents regularly failed to rear punctual and orderly children. By refusing to visit the classroom regularly, parents missed the chance to form close bonds with the teacher. Moreover, the drive for uniformity in instruction and in the classification of students also seemed to deepen the chasm that often separated school promoters and particular educational clientele. In addition to disputes over school visitation, apathy, punctuality, and corporal punishment, parents were often criticized for sending their children to school in an unkempt state and without the rudiments of scholarship: pencils, paper, and maps. Additionally, some parents fought for flexibility and freedom of choice in the curriculum at a time when the schools sought a single pattern of education, further intensifying debate.

Over a dozen years after the formation of the Milwaukee system, the school board regrettably revealed that parents still opposed a graded and uniform plan of instruction. "Questions of the kind here indicated have come up frequently during the past year," wrote the board in 1861.

> One parent declares that his child shall not study Grammar, and refuses her a book even--another says, let Mental Arithmetic alone; I want my son to learn to calculate interest. A third, my child must go into a

> higher department, dislike to have her
> study these primary studies.[57]

Parents obviously hoped to remain a force in their children's education. Yet this was generally viewed as "meddling." In this instance, the school board responded that "our schools are not for the purpose of scholars carrying a little of this or that branch of education, according to the caprice of a pupil or parent...Economy, success, and duty to all, demand that we hold on to our system of graded schools."[58]

Within a decade or so after these four school systems were established, children who in another time and setting might have been educated together in a single classroom were increasingly sorted into appropriate departments and grades, usually determined by the child's age. Courses of study were adopted, rules and regulations drafted, and children and parents expected to cooperate to make the new system operate smoothly.[59] Some parents who remembered the decentralized, less regimented days of the district school protested against the new order. In 1870, for example, a Mr. A. G. Clark sent a long communication to the Toledo school board. Clark was angry that his son, who attended Grammar School No. 2 with one of the school commissioner's children, was sent home from school because of his father's refusal to purchase a singing book for fifty cents called the Golden Robin. While young Clark and some classmates were dismissed, the commissioner's child, who also lacked the required text, was permitted to remain at school. This only increased the parent's discontent. Mr. Clark went on to complain that the binding on the music book was "very flimsy and the material poor; That his son had no taste for music, and his daughter [who attended the same class] practised at home, and for these, and other reasons...wished his children excused from the singing exercises and to be excused himself from the expense of providing said books."[60] His petition was refused, as were similar requests by parents to permit their children to veer from a uniform course of study.

Whether this was a stray example or a common source of dispute in Toledo is uncertain. Parents were rarely well organized and undoubtedly many of them lacked the courage to voice an individual complaint before the community leaders serving on the school board.

To complain did not fulfill the universal expectation that parents should cooperate with the schools, and yet that did not prevent parental interference. The Milwaukee school board asserted in 1861 that parents frequently interferred in decisions concerning what books their children read and which classes they attended, and Rochester's citizens during the same period stubbornly endorsed the reestablishment of the old district system. And although parents themselves rarely left many written records of their thoughts on education, they were continually subjected to critical examination in school reports in all of these cities. Parents, teachers, and school officials did not engage in daily combat, or else the state system constructed by the urban boosters would have perished long ago. What is clear from the schoolmen's own reports, however, is that social change in the form of new institutional developments and state intervention in schooling often promoted controversy and conflict between home and school. Educators laid most of the problems related to social and educational dislocation at the door of parents, who were regularly perceived as hindrances rather than as aids in the child's education.

A true equilibrium was never reached during these years in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City between the men of affairs who predominated in the evolution of the school systems and the children and parents who supposedly benefited from them. A single system of education would never satisfy people drawn from different ethnic groups, social classes, and religious backgrounds. Parents and teachers never engaged in full-time dispute, to be sure, but conflict brewed beneath the surface and erupted on a regular basis on different issues. The elite origins of the schools, formed in the booster atmosphere of the nineteenth century, guaranteed that conflict would infuse many different aspects of school development, from the system's emphasis on punctuality and discipline to graded classes.

That Mr. Clark could be told to purchase a particular singing book for his children was an insignificant event in Toledo's history, a small entry in volumes of dusty minute books. The event nevertheless symbolized the ascendancy of an educational system which had not existed three decades earlier. The familiar educational configurations many parents had known in their youth--an assortment of district schools, pay schools, and itinerant school masters, mixed with home instruction--were gradually displaced by new forms of social life. In a relatively short period of time, a handful of prominent individuals had charted a new educational course in these cities; a system of tax-supported schools replaced the unsystematic, unpredictable methods of education in the past. The attitudes of many parents, however, remained fastened to the days when their opinions mattered, producing the conflict and social tensions that affected the nineteenth century urban school. And when city boosters and school leaders pursued unpopular moral ends in state funded institutions, they discovered that social dissent could take very critical and more organized form.

III

In their quest for commercial leadership and educational dominance, civic boosters and school promoters in different communities faced a similar dilemma: how to make children and their parents internalize a respect for order, political stability, and faith in economic and moral progress. The ticking of the clocks, the adherance to rules and regulations, and the spectre of physical force in the classroom revealed the values that they deemed necessary if their city's development would surpass rival communities. They boasted of turning their swamps and forests into the next London or Paris; they were outspoken about the faulty social qualities of immigrant and impoverished families; and they were at all times quite adamant about the moral objectives of schooling. The educational systems were built for the people, not by them, and school leaders always willingly commented on how the moral activities of the school affected the world outside the classroom door.

Town boosters and school leaders in the nineteenth century certainly offered numerous justifications for the establishment of a system of schools, including training for citizenship in a republic, character formation, and the assimilation of the foreign born. However eclectic their arguments appeared, they usually testified to an elitist contempt for the masses, especially the thousands of immigrant and native-born poor inhabiting these cities. Immigrant children and their parents in particular were often called "pests," "vicious," and the dregs of society. As one Rochester Whig put it, America had become "a depository of filth for the old world."[61] Others were less blunt, but few questioned the imperfections of the children of the poor.

That education was a potent cure for the vice and crime caused by lower class life was a central tenet of common school reform. To question this proposition was tantamount to educational hersey, certain to produce ostracism and censure.[62] Education was better than a standing army, claimed one observer, for "if we retrench the wages of the schoolmaster, we must raise those of the recruiting sargeant."[63] Similarly, the Toledo Blade in 1849 asserted that "schools are absolutely necessary, to fuse together the discordant materials, and to organize the otherwise incongenial elements of society." Without a system of schools, children became "discontented, useless, and bad citizens."

> It is the ignorant that are vicious, and it is the vicious that commit the crimes, and destroy the peace, prosperity, and happiness of society. What is an educated or half educated people good for? They cannot govern themselves, much less govern others; and not only so, they are almost or quite ungovernable...They cannot be good statesmen, or divines, or lawyers, or doctors, or artizans, or mechanics, or tradesmen, or manufacturers, or farmers--and they make very poor laborers, and worse citizens.[64]

The elements of a sound moral training were varied; the social imperative was clear.

The moral aims of schooling, which triggered major social reactions in local cities, were demonstrated in many ways: the use of Bibles in the classroom, the opening of school lessons with prayer, the singing of religious hymns, and the dissemination of Protestant values across the city.[65] The schools advanced more than the Three R's and basic subjects. In accordance with the beliefs of the school boosters, they also taught values of social respectability, political stability, and an acceptance of an economic system based on profit. Children gained basic skills as well as encouragement to adopt a way of thinking, acting, and feeling. When they defined the basic objective of education, school leaders always highlighted its moral rather than intellectual dimensions. James M. Greenwood, a nationally prominent, no-nonsense fundamentalist in education, believed that the "central thought in the public school system is not how much grammar, arithmetic, and geography, but how to train the children--educate them--into orderly, quiet, methodical citizens."[66] As he told the Kansas City *Times* in 1879, equating schooling with the Three R's was the "lowest possible" perception imaginable and contrary to existing social practice. Rather, "honest character building is one of the essential functions of our schools, and so our teachers regard it."[67]

From their inception, the schools of Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City emphasized the importance of social cultivation as well as intellectual training. Though mental discipline was occasionally designated as the official aim of instruction, more common was the assertion that moral training was equal to if not more important than the training of children's intellectual faculties. Rochester's leading Whigs in the 1840s complained that "licentiousness" among the working people and immigrant masses caused the schools to become nurseries of "*mind* and *morals*--and in these subjects all unite. Where is the man in this city who does not want his child trained to *virtue* and *intelligence*?"[68] Toledo's school board early resolved that,

> Good morals being of the first importance and essential to the Scholars in their progress in useful knowledge, the pupils are strictly enjoined to avoid idleness and profanity, falsehood and deceit, and to conduct themselves in a sober, orderly, and decent manner both in and out of School, and to be punctual and constant in daily attendance.[69]

Punctuality, morality, and the profit system were all intertwined in 1869 when Van Horn of Kansas City wrote: "No schools, and a check is given to our prosperity, and a fearful blow to our moral and pecuniary interests."[70]

The claim that education built moral character and deterred vice and crime was argued *ad nauseam* during the nineteenth century. The children of the ignorant or vicious classes, it was warned, posed a threat to themselves and everyone around them, especially endangering the "moral and pecuniary interests" of the city. Henry O'Reilly of Rochester, Charles Hill of Toledo, Rufus King of Milwaukee, and James Greenwood of Kansas City, as well as other prominent figures in school reform, forcefully contended that education prevented crime and that all children needed a single set of appropriate values. None of them would have questioned Greenwood's position in his educational primer for teachers in 1887, which asserted that children had two paths before them. "One leads outside to the street--to vicious habits, lying, theft, drunkenness, disgrace, poverty, and wretchedness; a life without an aim, without a purpose, a wretched failure! The other leads to success in business, secures the confidence and approbation of mankind, elevates the race, dignifies humanity, and brings its possessor happiness and contentment in old age."[71] All this if one only chose the path to the schoolhouse door.

Children who passed through the new educational portals discovered that the school staff was often more interested in their morals than in their minds. While the schools promised to rid children of their illiteracy and ignorance, they were more fearful of the moral condition of youth. "Let mothers remember that there is no sickness like that of the mind, cramped with ignorance; and no death so dreadful as the extinction of all that is Godlike in the soul," claimed one Rochesterian.[72] A fellow citizen remarked that "good manners in children and youth are worth far more than good mathematics--gentility than geography."[73] Anson Smyth, Toledo's first school superintendent, was a graduate of Yale's divinity school and the former pastor of the wealthy First Congregational Church. In his early school reports he always assured parents that schooling would make their children both respectable and happy, since they learned not only "useful knowledge" but "what is of the highest possible importance, moral principles, order, decorum, truthfulness, purity and virtue."[74]

Teachers in all of these cities were expected to help rescue children from the viciousness of evil association, whether in the home or on the street. They were regularly screened by teachers' committees for evidence of their own "moral character," and, as the

Milwaukee school board related in 1870, were expected to "fulfill in great part the duties of a parent as well as the technical duties of an instructor. An acceptance of the trust implies a guardianship as to the morals and manners of the pupil, as well as to his intellectual development."[75] Moral training actually meant an inculcation of Protestant-oriented values, reflecting the religious preference of many of the educational boosters and school superintendents of the period. This particular form of moral training provoked some of the most volatile protests against the public schools. Conflict again reared its ugly head.

When Catholic parents increasingly attacked the Protestant nature of the public schools in this period, school officials simply responded that the moral training they provided was highly distinguishable from actual sectarian teaching. These officials were technically correct, but Protestantism formed the core of moral instruction in the schools. John Phillips, Kansas City's first school superintendent, characteristically instructed local teachers to educate children in the "elements of knowledge" gained from textbooks as well as to "inculcate those great principles of social morality which, by the common consent, are conducive to the well-being of society and government."[76] That meant, of course, the daily classroom reading of the Protestant version of the Bible. Superintendents, boosters, and school officials categorically assumed that the "common consent" meant Protestant dominance. To the rising objections of Catholics in these cities, who often disliked being taxed for Protestant institutions, school leaders merely retorted that "the culture of the moral nature is not more sectarian than the culture of the intellect...nor is the law of love to God and man more sectarian than the law of gravity--to teach the law of right, than to teach that two and two make four."[77] It was as simple as that.

Besides the meddling of parents and the sometimes irreverent behavior of their children, school systems therefore faced a new challenge. It was not the occasional and disturbing problems of tardy children, refusals to buy certain texts, or court cases on corporal punishment. The new assault was better organized and was led by Catholic parents and prelates who questioned the Protestant nature of instruction required by all the children of the citizenry. Competing Catholic school systems arose in direct opposition to the public schools not because these parents opposed moral training but because they disliked the particular moral values that flourished in the public schools. In every one of these four cities, especially Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee, town boosters and school leaders locked horns with thousands of Catholic immigrants who questioned the legitimacy of the evolving educational order. In Toledo, for example, the bishop in charge of the diocese ordered local priests to deny the sacraments to any adult Catholic whose children attended the public schools, which used Protestant versions of the Bible in the classroom. If Toledo's parochial school system was still not in its infancy, perhaps local priests could have followed his orders to the letter and posed an even stronger threat to the city's public school establishment.[78]

Catholics in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and many other cities demanded the division of school funds to aid in financing their own parochial systems. Major newspapers and school officials criticized such plans at every possible turn.[79] It was Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester, however, who best demonstrated the popular resistance to Protestant moral training in the schools. Reverend McQuaid challenged every assumption upon which the school systems were founded, and he effectively exposed the unique moral mission of the public schools.

As the first bishop of the Rochester district, McQuaid received national attention in the 1870s when he lectured and published tracts against the public schools. He argued that the schools were communistic, Protestant in tone, promoters of vice, more expensive than prisons, and a burden on the immigrant poor who, he claimed, preferred sectarian instruction in "Christian Free Schools" provided by their own tax dollars. "Parents have the right to educate their children," he insisted, and "it is wrong for the State to interfere with the exercise of this right."[80] By using everyone's taxes for a single system of education, Protestant town boosters and public school officials unjustly denied other parents the right to select and finance their own forms of moral instruction for their children.

Along with many less famous contemporaries, McQuaid recognized that the state was not a neutral force in education but represented particular social interests and excluded others. Because of this he constantly made life difficult for the defenders of the public schools. When the Rochester school board reluctantly ended Bible reading and the singing of religious hymns in the schools in the 1870s, McQuaid then took the opportunity to attack them as "Godless" institutions. The local schools' Protestant cast was partially shattered, but their new mold was equally vulnerable to his diatribes. In a series of articles in the Journal of Education in the early 1880s, McQuaid continued his harangues against the schools. He demonstrated that crime rates had increased rather than lessened with the proliferation of public schooling; he again argued that Catholics were unjustly forced to finance two separate systems of education; and he alleged that vice had been encouraged at recess in the Rochester schools. McQuaid very nicely quoted local school officials who admitted that the immorality of children at playtime plagued the system for years.[81]

McQuaid provoked a very lively local and national debate, driving Protestants and Catholics into opposing corners. Educators from across the nation tried to counter the Bishop's assertions in the pages of the Journal. A. D. Mayo, one of the nation's leading school promoters and an important amateur historian of education, was appalled by McQuaid's contentions.[82] Rev. McQuaid placed all of the defenders of the schools on the defensive. He heard some questionable statistics showing that criminals had less formal schooling than non-criminals, speculation that more public schools would halt the rising crime rate, and assertions that the schools were not Godless but the repository of all that was good and just in nineteenth-century civilization. In Rochester, Superintendent S. A. Ellis had the unenviable task of responding to McQuaid's forceful charges. The best he could muster was agreement that "this question of moral training in education is a vital one, lying, as it does, at the very foundation of all true character building. No system of education, in fact, is worthy the name that does not lay stress on it. For it must be admitted that intellectual training alone cannot be relied

49

upon to ensure correct living and good citizenship."[83]

They were weak rejoinders to telling criticisms. In their preoccupation with legitimating a single educational system for all children, public school men failed to overturn convincingly the arguments of critics like McQuaid. They failed to see that parents could legitimately differ on what constituted proper moral training and that there was some measure of injustice in forcing Catholics to pay for institutions they opposed and often did not use. All the same, the character of local debates between Protestants and Catholics revealed the centrality of moral training in nineteenth-century educational thought. Protestants and Catholics were interested less in promoting intelligence and critical thinking in children than in saving children from lives of immorality and the taxpayers from building more prisons; they framed their debates on education accordingly. McQuaid's faith that Catholic and sectarian free schools would retard crime was as questionable as the beliefs of his opponents that their institutions could achieve that end.[84] In both parochial and public education the moral dimension of schooling remained preponderant. Conflicts emerged not on whether to train the moral beliefs of the child but over what values to inculcate and how to most effectively promote them.

With the continuing availability of some private schooling and the rise of competing parochial education systems in each of these four cities, educational leaders searched for additional ways to gather more support for the public schools. They feared that too many parents might be attracted to parochial schools and other institutions if the public schools failed to respond to some of the criticisms leveled at them. Hence local boosters and school leaders were forced to make unexpected concessions in some areas of educational policy. One especially important reform was the addition of foreign language instruction, particularly German. While the teaching of Polish, Italian, and other languages in the schools became a controversial issue in the Progressive era, German was the chief language whose inclusion in the curriculum sparked many debates in the nineteenth century. With a large number of German immigrants inhabiting Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee, it became one further point of controversy and conflict in the period.

In petitioning for German instruction in their neighborhood schools, immigrant parents endeavored to make local institutions recognize the unique cultural backgrounds of many children. Long petitions on the beauty of the German language as well as art, music, and literature were presented to school boards in dozens of American cities. Parents triumphed in direct proportion to their numbers and political power. In Kansas City, where German foreign born residents comprised only 6 percent of the total population in 1870, their petitions were rejected. In Rochester, where they accounted for 12 percent of the population, German was adopted as an elective in the 1870s (a time when Bishop McQuaid was particularly antagonistic toward the schools); but instruction only lasted for a few years. In Toledo and Milwaukee, where German immigrants comprised 17 percent and 32 percent of the total population respectively, German fared much better.[85]

By 1852 German was already taught in one ethnic neighborhood in Toledo, and state laws in the 1870s required the establishment of German classes whenever seventy-five freeholders from a particular neighborhood district petitioned the school board. In the late 1850s German instruction also began in some Milwaukee schools, which served the nation's largest Germanic population. Debates raged fiercely between supporters and opponents of German instruction in these two cities as elsewhere, but the German school board members in both cities made it an integral part of the curriculum until World War I. This instruction was provided not because of some idealistic quest for bilingual education or the preservation of familiar customs and languages in a strange land but, as the evidence shows, primarily because of a desire to assimilate Germans and attract them to the public schools.[86]

When Gustav Trumpff, a German-born but assimilated President of the Milwaukee school board, defended the teaching of German from nativist attack in the 1870s, he spoke little of the beauty of the German language or its culture. School leaders feared that many immigrant parents would attend the thriving German academies and private schools that still served the populace in the 1850s. With thousands of children in private or parochial schools, immigrants would avoid the process of Americanization, since they would bypass institutions whose chief mission was the training of citizens. By providing foreign language instruction, the public schools undermined the private sector, strengthened their own position, and made many German parents happy. What better way to integrate immigrants into the American mainstream than by luring Germans into the public schools. It was all very calculating, and prominent Milwaukeeans regularly applauded the Americanizing functions of foreign language training. A knowledgeable Milwaukeean noted in 1899 that German language instruction was championed by "shrewd politicians who cared neither for the educational value of German nor for the beauty of its literature, but who recognized the...strength of the so-called German vote."[87]

The situation was very similar in Toledo. In the 1870s, a local teacher of German in the public schools recalled that foreign language instruction was a primary way in which "German private and parochial schools" in earlier decades "were swept out of existence."[88] And Superintendent DeWolf also frankly revealed to the Blade that German was an ideal way to uplift the schools and destroy private initiative in education. In a letter in 1875, he revealed his thoughts on the matter. "For many years it has been seen that only by constant watchfulness and effort could this important beneficence, our Public School System, be maintained against a tide of adverse interests getting every year stronger and stronger." After considering the merits of foreign language training, he concluded that German was the best way "of enlisting a large body of citizens in these schools, who, while supporting private schools, could feel little interest in the Public Schools."[89] Once again, school leaders had undermined outside criticisms and strengthened the state system.

Immigrant parents definitely applauded the introduction of foreign language classes in these two cities even if they did not fully share the motives of assimilated Germans and others who sat on the school board. As long as the children learned the language of their parents' homeland, Germans in Toledo and Milwaukee were satisfied. As in every area of educational policy, the history of German instruction was shaped in an atmosphere of conflict and debate. Competing pressures--parental desires for foreign language training, and school promoter desires to undermine the private educational sector--forced the adoption of a new program in the public schools. Educational development during these decades was marked by intense conflict; it was hardly an era of consensus politics. On some issues, citizens organized their followers and fought the public system, best exemplified by the Catholics who built competing systems and futilely attempted to divide the school fund. Many other parents fought the schools single-handedly. On any given day they might complain about the use of corporal punishment, discipline, punctuality, language instruction, and even the cost, quality, and utility of Golden Robin singing books.

In this atmosphere of debate, a handful of prominent individuals had nevertheless constructed a single system of publicly-financed schooling in local cities within a few short decades. They had not shaped history just as they pleased, but by the 1890s these systems had already withstood challenges and insults from vicious homes, contrary parents, tardy children, angry Germans, and even Bishop McQuaid. These systems would soon encounter a new generation of critics, ranging from class-conscious workers to club women to municipal Socialists. Conflict remained central to urban life, and as a result the schools would be greatly affected by competing visions of the social order in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. School leaders and city boosters soon encountered what became known as the age of Progressive reform.

Introduction To Part II

The 1890s was a seminal decade in the history of the common school. Like every institution in American life, the urban school faced an unrelenting torrent of social criticism. Few immediately realized it, but mass instruction had reached an important historical juncture. From the depression of 1893 to the conclusion of World War I, a wide range of urban activists beat steady paths to the school house door. When they were through, there was no denying the existence of tangible educational transformations. Increased enrollments, new curricular programs, innovative social services, and changing patterns of administrative control were some of the obvious indicators of change.[1] By strengthening the holding power of the school and extending its reach in new directions, the state became an even stronger influence in the social welfare of youth than antebellum reformers would have ever imagined. And, as in those earlier years, school policy in the Progressive era was shaped by local citizens who warmly endorsed the value of schooling but strongly disagreed over what constituted desirable educational change.

One of the most fascinating aspects of educational change at the turn of the century is uncovering its complex origins. To assert that change is a "complex" phenomenon does not preclude the fact that dominant problems confronted every citizen in a particular historical era. Nor does it eliminate the need for the historian to identify the transforming ideas of periods of rapid change.[2] Rather, a recognition of historical complexity reminds the historian that school policy, then as now, resulted from the various degrees of consensus and conflict, accommodation and resistance, that characterized different individual's responses to pressing contemporary problems. For example, almost every urban educational policy maker in the Progressive era faced three basic problems: the intensification of urban growth, the rise of corporate capitalism, and changing patterns of immigration. It was difficult to ignore, in ostrich-like fashion, such fundamental sources of change, and the character of the school's response to them resulted from the decisions made systematically by important policy makers.

In tracing, as this study does, the evolution and implementation of various social services in the schools, one inevitably confronts the task of recapturing the human dynamics of change, of explaining not only how and why new ideas spring forth in the minds of men and women, but also of determining what differences social invention made in the lives of ordinary citizens. Schools did not respond capriciously to the changes transforming the larger society but, like all human contrivances, reacted to the imperatives of key decision makers. Rather than making the bland generalization that schools changed because the larger social order was altered through urbanization, industrialization, and immigration, one must ask more specifically: Exactly who was responsible for increasing the social functions of education during the Progressive era? What were the underlying intentions and aspirations of reformers? What alternatives existed to the policies that became institutionalized? What role did formally trained educators, compared to various lay people, play in the expansion of state intervention in youth policy? More basically, why did so many people seek the particular reforms as they did, when they did?

Since the 1890s marked the origins of municipal Progressivism, most of the answers to these questions are hidden in the social dynamics that were unleashed in city after city during that exciting decade. It was, as contemporaries recognized, an intense period filled with enormous contrasts and contradictions: the passing of the frontier line and the expansion of cities, an era of depression and then prosperity, peace and war, and movements of increasing numbers of people to the city from rural areas and Southern and Central Europe. The period saw the intensification of monopoly control over the economy, as well as the prevalence of strikes, boycotts, lockouts, and other examples of labor-capital discord that helped give birth to the most powerful Socialist movement in the nation's history. Just why men's and women's minds changed so dramatically in the 1890s, leading to corresponding changes in urban school policy and social welfare, remains thus far an unsolved riddle in the history of Progressive reform.[3]

The emergence of competing interest groups in school reform in the Progressive era reflected the modern struggle of different classes in Western capitalist nations to utilize the state for their own particular ends. As Ralph Miliband argues in The State In Capitalist Society, despite all the hearty claims of individualism and laissez faire advanced in many capitalist countries,

> More than ever before men now live in the shadow of the state. What they want to achieve, individually or in groups, now mainly depends on the state's sanction and support. But since that sanction and support are not bestowed indiscriminately, they must, ever more directly, seek to influence and shape the state's power and purpose, or try to appropriate it altogether. It is for the state's attention, or for its control, that men compete; and it is against the state that beat the waves of social conflict. It is to an ever greater degree the state which men encounter as they confront other men. This is why, as social beings, they are also political beings, whether they know it or not.[4]

Some citizens might have been disinterested in what transpired in urban school reform on the grass roots, but neither they nor their children could remain unaffected by contemporary educational change and social service reform.

Progress And Poverty

The age is going ahead at a
two-forty pace.
Kansas City _Journal of Commerce_,
1875

What are you doing to help the
unemployed who walk the streets
night and day looking for a
handout?
Kansas City _Mail_, 1893

I

By 1900 cities like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City possessed many of the characteristics envisioned by town boosters of the antebellum and postbellum periods. Industrial metropolises stood where Indians lived only a century before. Men like Robert T. Van Horn, who was still active in Kansas City politics in the 1890s and had predicted this industrial transformation, were heralded by local residents and historians as prophets of a new social order. Although the pattern and pace of urban growth and industrial change varied from city to city, Henry Adams' famous claim that the dynamo had replaced the Virgin birth as the symbol of civilization at least seemed plausible.[1] For every doubting critic of the new industrial order, there were countless men of affairs who carried the booster gospel into the new century, proclaiming that the new order represented moral and economic advancement. Instead of recognizing the contradictions of progress and poverty, they instead viewed accelerated movements to the city, factory, and school as obvious indices of human progress.

Industrial leaders and elite social observers rarely discussed the human dislocation and suffering that accompanied late nineteenth-century progress. Booster publications and local newspapers routinely applauded the rise of the "Great Industries" of their particular communities and staggered their readers with rows of statistics on industrial and commercial growth.[2] For the champions of industrial capitalism, the men who owned the means of new forms of production, society seemed to move onward and upward. Little was said by either industrial elites or local chroniclers of change of the sweat and tears wrung from the men, women, and young people in the factories, or of the painful adjustments required of rural folk and ethnic groups to time discipline, or of the rise of social classes that alienated and divided citizens in every city. They acted as if the boards of trade and chambers of commerce had single-handedly fashioned an expansive economy. For example, Milwaukee boosters in the late nineteenth century quite typically asserted that a city could not "rest content...upon purely commercial pursuits," since "prosperity" and "future growth" were entirely "dependent in a large measure upon the success of its manufacturing industries."[3] Although progress and poverty flourished simultaneously during the period, boosters perceived the world through rose-colored glasses.

The emergence of a more intensively urban, industrial society, which set the backdrop for the origins of Progressive school reform, occurred so rapidly in the late nineteenth century that even local boosters viewed it with a mixture of awe and delight. A German businessman in Milwaukee in 1886 sounded the common refrain that in a few short years his town "had become a genuinely important industrial city."[4] Gross statistics on urban manufacturing highlight these tremendous social transformations, the onset of a new way of life. With a larger industrial base than cities like Rochester, Toledo, and Kansas City, Milwaukee experienced a spectacular growth in the number of manufacturing establishments by the turn of the century.

Milwaukee already had 800 manufacturing facilities of varying size in 1880. Within two decades the number quadrupled. In addition to the continuing importance of its famous breweries, the city regained its world leadership in leather processing and also became a competitive force in the steel and iron industry. In 1900 almost one out of every five workers in Milwaukee industry were iron and steel workers or employed in closely-related machine shops.[5] Heavy industry was centered in the city's South Side, where Polish immigrants competed for unskilled jobs in the rolling mills and established ethnic communities in this otherwise heavily German city. In a relatively short period of time, Milwaukee had a sizeable industrial working class, workers who exchanged their labor for a wage and who did not own the means of production. The number of "wage earners" engaged in manufacturing and mechanical jobs increased from twenty thousand to approximately fifty thousand in less than twenty years. Over $110 million was invested in manufacturing in Milwaukee in 1900, well over five times the amount of investment twenty years earlier.[6]

Rochester's growth during this period was also very impressive.

Long noted for its beautiful nurseries and horticulture, the Flower City increasingly became a Factory City. It had less than half the capital investment in manufacturing of Milwaukee in 1900 because of its smaller population base, but it had nevertheless tripled the number of manufacturing establishments in two decades. One-half of the gainfully employed citizens of Rochester in 1900 worked in manufacturing and mechanical endeavors, a figure which was slightly higher than the percentage in Milwaukee.[7] Unlike Milwaukee or Toledo, however, Rochester was never a major center of heavy industry, a fact which had important effects on the nature of its labor movement. Travelers in this city did not see puffs of smoke from steel mills or blast furnaces but heard the humming of sewing machines and conversations on the price of shoes.

Like many New England cities, Rochester became a regional center of clothing and shoe production. Census figures reveal that one out of every four men and women with occupations in 1900 worked in the textile industry.[8] With the rise of industrial capitalism, as Socialist Eugene Debs eloquently argued, these "men" and "women" were often reduced to "hands" in the productive process, part of the larger degradation of modern work:

> In the capitalist system the soul has no business. It cannot produce profit by any process of capitalist calculation.
> The working hand is what is needed for the capitalist's tool and so the human must be reduced to a hand...
> A thousand hands to one brain--the hands of workingman, the brain of a capitalist.
> A thousand dumb animals, in human form--a thousand slaves in fetters of ignorance, their heads having to run to hands--all these owned and worked and fleeced by one stock-dealing, profit-mongering capitalist. This is capitalism![9]

Debs' insights accurately captured the perspectives of Rochester's business leaders, heirs of the booster tradition. Business elites embellished local publications with their own names, pictures, and biographies, saving a line or two for their "hands" while remaining silent on their anti-union sentiments.[10] The changing character of the local economy, however, decidedly shaped Rochester's labor movement. While Socialists infiltrated Milwaukee's strong trade union movement by the turn of the century, Eastman Kodak and related industries diversified Rochester's economy in the same period, and it was increasingly known as a white-collar, non-union city.[11]

Sparked by the natural gas boom in Northwestern Ohio in the late nineteenth century, Toledo also engaged in an aggressive drive for industrial supremacy. Its 440 manufacturing establishments in 1880 mushroomed to over one thousand in 1900 as Toledo's business community made an important bid for regional economic dominance. With less than half of the population of Milwaukee in 1900 (and smaller than Rochester), Toledo had only one-third of the manufacturing establishments of Wisconsin's largest city. Like Milwaukee, however, it developed considerable heavy industry; it had almost the same percentage of workers engaged in the steel and iron industry (16 per cent).[12]

Just as heavy industry was centered in Milwaukee's immigrant South Side, Toledo built its steel and iron plants in one corner of town on the East Side. This area was separated from the rest of the city geographically by the Maumee River and culturally by its unskilled Hungarian residents. Part of the East Side was called Birmingham, since its drab skies and working-class appearance resembled England's famous industrial center. The Hungarians largely manned the steel plants and made Birmingham their home.[13] Toledo also became widely known for its glass production, particularly through the work of Edward D. Libbey, and its proximity to Detroit furthered its economic expansion. The city annually provided millions of dollars worth of parts and accessaries for the auto industry after the turn of the century. Less white collar than Rochester, its labor unions were certainly more aggressive than those of Rochester but timid compared to their Socialist counterparts in Milwaukee.

Robert T. Van Horn's boasts during the Civil War that Kansas City would soon become the crossroads for Western trade and manufacturing have been publicized by many historians as archetypes of frontier journalism and the nineteenth-century booster spirit. Seemingly every small-town editor marveled at the benefits of local geography, climate, the labor force, and his community's accessibility to markets to try to lure capital investment for future growth. The only difference between Van Horn and hundreds of competitors is that Kansas City had triumphed when so many competitors had failed. A tiny trading post in 1850, Kansas City witnessed dizzying rates of economic and social expansion in less than forty years.

Commerce and trade rather than manufacturing per se remained the key prop of Kansas City's economy. The percentage of workers engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits in 1900 provides a rough though useful index to how Kansas City differed from Milwaukee, Rochester, and Toledo. Approximately 25 percent of its total male and female laborers worked in industries, compared with 35 percent in Toledo, 45 percent in Milwaukee, and 50 percent in Rochester.[14] That does not mean that industrial growth was not present there, for the rate of capital investment in the city's manufacturing development between 1880 and 1900 was higher than the other three cities: an amazing 1260 percent. Such notable efforts at industrialization should not disguise the fact that Kansas City was still primarily a center of commerce than a manufacturing town. For example, in 1900 Kansas City and Rochester both had slightly more than 160,000 people. Rochester nevertheless had several hundred more factories with double the capital investment; it also had twice as many wage-earners in manufacturing jobs. Kansas City was simply less industrial.[15]

While Rochester was famous for its textiles, Toledo for its glass and mills, and Milwaukee for its beer, tanning, and heavy industry, Kansas City was a vital entrepot for Western trade. It was a gateway to the West and all of its alluring markets. For this reason, by 1900 the largest group of the city's workers (38 percent) was employed in occupations related to trade and transportation, much higher than either Toledo (32 percent), Milwaukee (27 percent), or Rochester (26 percent).[16] In addition, Kansas City's extensive stockyards by the 1870s reflected its importance in the meat-packing industry, which continues to this day. Railroads transported thousands of cattle to the city annually, and hog slaughtering and meat processing assumed considerable prominence. By the early 1890s, roughly half of the factory workers was associated in some way with industries owned by Armour, Swift, and their competitors. The flavor of the Wild West, with tales of cattle drives and roundups, remained vital to local folklore and civic identity well into the new century.[17]

Local boosters always characterized the meat packing industry as another example of business acumen in exploiting the area's "natural advantages" in geography and in promoting "their economic and judicious utilization."[18] Yet it is clear that in Kansas City as elsewhere industrial growth only triumphed through the labor of men, women, and youth who inhabited these communities. Technology was useless without a strong and reliable work force. Industrial progress was predicated on the movement from the farm to the city and on the waves of immigration that similarly transformed local communities. The lives of these people, who ultimately produced the wealth but did not equally share it, were absent from the countless business publications that continually boasted of material and moral progress during the period. The evolution of liberal and more radical reform movements in the 1890s--which focused in part on the school's place in public welfare--stemmed from these economic and social changes, on a growing recognition that not all citizens enjoyed material progress and that in some instances the human price of technological advancement had been dear.

Population grew at a frenzied pace in these cities in the late nineteenth century. With a population of over 115,000 in 1880, Milwaukee was the largest of the four cities, followed by Rochester (nearly 90,000), Kansas City (over 55,000), and Toledo (over 50,000). This ranked order remained essentially stable in 1900, except that Kansas City narrowly surpassed Rochester's size to earn second place. The percentage increase in population between 1880 and 1900 for Rochester (182 percent), Toledo (263 percent), Milwaukee (247 percent), and Kansas City (294 percent) typified the movement to the cities that contemporaries witnessed as immigration from Europe intensified and millions of rural citizens sought new homes and opportunities.[19] These cities grew in size, in industrial complexity, and in the kinds of residents who brought life and profits to local communities.

There were notable differences in the varieties of people who inhabited these four cities just as there were variations in the kinds of industries and commercial developments that sustained their economies. A closer look at the character of these people in 1890, just prior to the onset of various reform movements ushering in the Progressive era, reconstructs some of the human flavor and dynamics of these communities. Cities were made of more than iron and steel, or machine shops, foundries, and garment factories. There was more to life than the driving rhythms of the machinery and the ubiquitous morning and evening whistle. Clashing against the sights and sounds of the factories were older cultural practices of the thousands of foreign-born residents and displaced rural folk who now called these cities home.

By 1890 Milwaukee's ethnic heritage was quite distinctive. Fully 39 percent of the total population of 204,000 was foreign born. Known as the Deutsch-Athens in the mid-nineteenth century, Milwaukee retained a strong Teutonic cast since nearly one-third of the total population was born in Germany. A distinct ethnic culture flourished in the Northwestern and Western parts of town, though Germans lived throughout the city.[20] Bayrd Still has appreciatively written that "there were public buildings that might have stood in Strassburg or Nuremburg, ornate residences that were influenced by the German Renaissance, and German faces, German signs, Teutonic speech."[21] German foods, music, shooting clubs, and singing societies as well as the ever present beer gardens provided camaraderie and recreation. Incredible as it seems, Milwaukee's beer gardens in 1890 had a seating capacity of over 105,000, room enough for over half of the entire city! In the world of business and politics, in the schools and press, Germans had made an unmistakable mark on city life.[22]

Dozens of different immigrant groups inhabited Milwaukee, but it was still primarily a German city. The "new" immigration of Southern and Central Europeans had not yet altered the character of the population, though their visibility would increase drastically in the next decade. Once politically influential and a challenge to German hegemony, the Irish became a small part of the total population, and they generally resided in the poorest, least desirable section of town: the Bloody Third. By the end of the nineties, the Italians, who accounted for less than one percent of the population in all of these cities in 1890, would move into the Bloody Third and make it their new home.[23]

Visitors to the industrial South Side encountered additional signs of the growing importance of the new immigration. Over the years the South Side became a haven for the Poles. The Census already demonstrated that they were 5 percent of the population; few realized that they would surpass the Germans as the leading ethnic group within three decades. Intensely Roman Catholic, these largely unskilled newcomers quickly established segments of their own culture, and built a large parochial school system as a bulwark of their faith. There were fraternal orders, singing groups, and athletic clubs for the men and rosary societies and other activities for the women. Travelers to the South Side could find only names "that end with a sneeze," as Ignatz rivaled Fritz as a leading name in Milwaukee.[24]

After Milwaukee, Rochester was the next city with a significant percentage of foreign-born residents, totaling 30 percent of the 133,000 residents in 1890. Here, too, the Germans represented the largest foreign-born group in the total population (13 percent). As in Milwaukee, the Irish began to lose their once visible role in municipal politics. The Poles and Italians still accounted for less than 1 percent of the people. Second-generation Germans continued to exhibit considerable influence in Rochester after the 1890s, as old and new immigrant groups struggled for cultural dominance. Walter Rauschenbusch, whose father was earlier a prominent German newcomer, became internationally known for his writings on the Social Gospel. And men like Isaac Adler, also a second generation German, were leading lights in Good Government and educational reforms at the turn of the century.[25]

As in Rochester and Milwaukee, Germans constituted the largest foreign-born group in Toledo in 1890, constituting 15 percent of the total population. The Poles, however, later surpassed the Germans as the major ethnic group in the Progressive era just as they did in

66

Milwaukee. While the Germans were scattered across much of Toledo, the Poles primarily settled in two separate communities, in the Northern and Southwestern parts of town. Polish foods, dialects, and traditions added variety to civic life. The Hungarians, another important new group, worked in the grueling heat of the steel mills on the East Side. There they lived also, in an enclave separated from the rest of Toledo by the Maumee River and by their own indigenous culture.[26] The new immigration increasingly altered the composition and flavor of urban life, as Italians, Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, and other nationality groups arrived by the thousands in these cities.

While thousands of first and second generation immigrants inhabited Milwaukee, Rochester, and Toledo in the 1890s, Kansas City was a bastion of the native born. In 1890 only 16 percent of its population of 132,000 was foreign born, compared to the higher rates in Toledo (27 percent), Rochester (30 percent), and Milwaukee (39 percent). Kansas City was less industrial and less foreign than these cities. Its demographic structure was very distinctive, since it had a higher percentage of blacks than the other cities and only a small percentage of German (5 percent) and Irish (4 percent) residents.[27] The great majority of its residents were native born; Southerners in particular swelled its population after the Civil War. And only after the turn of the century did a new immigrant group, the Italians, finally surpass the Germans as Kansas City's largest ethnic population.

Even though the Poles and the Italians comprised only a small proportion of the residents of these cities in the early 1890s, their increased visibility brought them scorn and ridicule in the native press. That these newcomers were often poor and Roman Catholic did not help them; neither did their unfamiliarity with the English language and native customs. When the Kansas City Mail asserted in 1894 that "foreigners who don't know the constitution from a brick house should not be naturalized," it provided an early glimpse of the animosity toward new immigrants that culminated in the National Origins Acts three decades later.[28] The Italians in Kansas City were openly derided in newspapers. "No one can pass through the [central city] market without being caught hold of and importuned in some foreign dago gibberish to 'buya de banan,' 'de beacha,' 'de potate,'" complained one angry citizen who feared for the safety of American women.[29]

Called the "dusky sons of the Orient" by those who slept through geography class, the Italians and other new residents were stereotyped as murderers, drunkards, and thieves. Rochester's Democrat and Chronicle and Kansas City's Star endorsed immigrant restriction as early as 1894, especially for the new immigrants. Illiterate, poor, and ignorant of American ways, these newcomers reportedly formed the pool of recruits for "labor riots" and were an "embarrassment" to the entire country. "The Russians, Poles, Portuguese, Hungarians, and Italians who come to America...as a class are not desirable as citizens," wrote an editor in Rochester. "They do not easily assimilate with the American people, but form classes and communities among themselves, greatly increasing the difficulty of administering law and order."[30]

Although everyone was not welcomed with open arms, these newcommers all contributed to the accelerated growth of an urban industrial society in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City in the late nineteenth century. "The age is going ahead at a two-forty pace," wrote one Kansas Citian, and change included the conflicts produced by ethnic diversity. Growth in commerce, industry, and people was everywhere apparent and with it came visible forms of conflict and division: school policy always reflected this elementary fact. By the turn of the century, urban boosters continued to assemble mountains of facts and figures for capitalists to prove that their cities were lovely places to live and congenial for more intensive monetary investment. In 1903 the Milwaukee Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, taking a passage of Dickens' Hard Times out of context, prefaced its annual booster pamphlet with the utilitarian position that "facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon facts. Stick to Facts, Sir."[31] According to the perspectives of the boosters, the facts of history were clear: urban America grew stronger, richer, and better. Yet the contradiction of poverty amid wealth, scarcity amid abundance, was not lost upon many critics in the Nineties who found themselves living in a period of hard times.

II

The nineteenth-century booster spirit has been well preserved in popular images of the 1890s. It has often been remembered as the "Gay 90's," a time when the bicycle craze fascinated the nation and when the Boy Orator from the Platte, William Jennings Bryan, began his colorful efforts to capture the Presidency. It has certainly been portrayed as an exciting time and one of achievement. School children still read about a famous charge up San Juan Hill, learn about the swift military victory over Spain, and are told of the return of prosperity after the election of William McKinley.[32]

Like the industrial and population statistics of local cities, these are surface impressions that fail to convey the grim social realities and ethnic, class, and social conflicts that existed during the decade. Progress and growth were achieved at tremendous human cost. In particular, the men, women, and children who lived in rural and urban America in the Nineties mostly faced hard times at a time when injunctions were liberally used against labor unions and private charity was the primary source of relief for people in distress. Farmers, especially in the South, suffered from increased poverty and land tenancy. Urban workers often lost their jobs, their homes, and the ability to feed and clothe their children adequately. Not all members of the working class, of course, were in such desperate straits. Unemployment nevertheless reached epidemic proportions, and a period of so-called gaiety and national achievement produced America's modern Populist and Socialist movements.[33]

Booms and busts were common to the nineteenth-century economies of Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. None of the depressions of previous decades, however, matched the severity and social import of the economic malaise that gripped these cities between 1893 and 1897. The major social transformations that occurred in school and society in the early twentieth century were rooted in community developments of these critical years.[34] Despite assurances by urban boosters that growth was imminent and would mean universal prosperity and progress, unemployment among the urban masses reached critical heights. And, with the rise of radical social and political movements, many believed that the nation had reached a turning point.

Those individuals who engaged in incessant soul searching and ultimately questioned the legitimacy of certain aspects of the established order--Jacob Coxey, Eugene Debs, the Social Gospelers, the Populists, and suffrage leaders--were regularly denounced as "cranks" and disturbers of the peace by the Republican and Democratic press. "This age is peculiarly prolific of the 'genus, crank,'" wrote a Kansas City paper in 1893. "Wild eyed, howling, vicious, and preposterous cranks abound. You see them every day. You meet them on every corner. They pop up in the rostrums, in our pulpits, and as frequently in our legislative halls."[35] Some of what critics dismissed as crankism was really the first stirrings of a new social conscience.

The depression nurtured many alternative visions of economic, social, and educational reconstruction. Critics exposed many of the contradictions of capitalist society and tried to mobilize large numbers of men and women in the quest for a new society. Against the bravado of the Van Horns and the city boosters arose competing voices which asked why poverty haunted a land of plenty, why corruption festered on school boards, why some children went to school with tattered clothes and empty bellies. These have always been unpleasant questions, and the "cranks" of the Nineties infuriated many in their search for answers.

The central tenets of what can be called early Progressive school reform developed during these depression years. The men, women, and organizations that promoted novel ideas on educational change in these cities through World War I--and who are the focal points of upcoming chapters--often first appeared on the local scene in the Nineties. They set in motion many of the ideas and social perspectives that not only challenged existing educational practice but also shaped future progressive thinking. Progressive schooling was not the brainchild of the educational establishment; on the contrary, later analysis will demonstrate that it grew in spite of the existing educational leadership in local cities. For example, new social services like vacation schools, playgrounds, social centers, breakfasts and lunches for the poor, and many other innovations promoted by grass-roots Progressives commonly originated outside of the public schools through the varied activities of settlement workers, women's club volunteers, parent organizations, labor unions, and Populist and Socialist parties.[36]

The rise of experimentalism in education, the increased emphasis on expanding the social role of the schools, and greater attention to bettering parent-teacher relationships constituted some of the central features of Progressive school reform on the municipal level. They emerged as vital issues during these years as external reform forces interacted with each other and with school officials. Women's clubs, Socialist parties, trade unions, moral reform groups, and other organizations were primarily responsible for many of the notable educational changes of the next few decades; grass-roots reform movements resulted from the interaction of many different forces and did not flow from a single source. Suffice it to say at this point that the origins and dynamic of local school reform lay in this process of interaction between competing school and community groups that became highly visible in the hard times of the Nineties. The depression was one of the major sources of the reform spirit of the Progressive era.

The depression of 1893 was catastrophic for an increasingly urbanized and industrial nation that so publicly prized economic and social progress. There was untold suffering and distress that never became a conspicuous concern of census workers or the authors of local business tracts. Instead of causing citizens to despair or to hinder the broadening of their social perspectives, the depression seemed to cause significant numbers of men and women to think critically about the causes of social distress and the role of schooling in bettering the human condition. This happened despite the fact that local newspapers wrote glowing editorials on the future commercial and industrial growth of their city long after the realities of the depression seemed to invalidate their bloated positions.[37] For nearly five long years these cities were gripped by depression, by an event that so dominated the lifestyles of citizens that it challenged many of them to re-evaluate the conditions of material and social existence. Many men and women who entered the Nineties with confidence and faith in their society left it with gnawing doubts and hope for a better social order. For many people the Depression became the single most important event in their evolution as social reformers or urban radicals.

As the principal means of formal communication between citizens before the age of radio and television, local newspapers regularly disseminated selected information to the people on the progress of the economy, the state of politics, and the health of the nation's social institutions. Whether Republican or Democratic, or even independent, newspapers during these years firmly supported private enterprise, private property, and the emergent capitalist order. They all dismissed anarchism, socialism, and communism as alien ideologies and unacceptable theories of inferior thinkers. Because they all tended to support the market economy in times of crisis (Republicans and Democrats attacked each other, not the economic system), newspapers poorly conveyed the gloomy news of depression. When the first business setbacks occurred in the spring of 1893, even national analysts frankly admitted that the country was totally unprepared and ill-informed on the crisis. A market analyst for the North American Review asserted that the depression "startled us like a flash of lightning out of a clear sky."[38] One prescient writer believed that although panics had afflicted the nation in the past century, this one "will go into history as distinct from any that preceded it."[39] Events proved that it was a world-wide depression of enormous magnitude, reflecting the growing interconnections between America's capitalist economy and international trade.

Urban newspapers accustomed to writing in terms of growth and spiraling commercial sales were oblivious to the impending disaster and later hesitant to admit its existence. The Toledo Blade, the former Whig and now the Republican standard bearer, published in the old spirit of frontier boosterism. Toledo in 1892 was no longer the "Future Great," it pointed out. "She is the Present Great. She sits like a queen here by the Maumee, with happy people, who are her jewels."[40] Within a year the depression had impoverished many of the royal subjects. Editors in Kansas City characteristically predicted continual growth and prosperity all the while disaster approached. In early 1892, for example, the Democratic Star described the country as a "boundless continent" which provided opportunities for every hard-working, sober resident.[41] The Star's opposition paper, the Kansas City Mail, similarly envisioned an auspicious future. "Kansas City starts out the fall of 1892 with a better prospect than it has had in five years. The indications are that an era of prosperity is dawning."[42]

When the first national business failures resulted during the following spring, editors in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City either ignored them or dismissed them as aberrations. Throughout the early summer of 1893, for example, the Star warned against pessimism and predicted glorious economic revivals.[43] The reality was very different. After seeing numerous articles portraying growth in local trade and industry, Kansas Citians were informed of the obvious: the onset of depression. The influential National Bank of Kansas City collapsed in early July; several smaller banks soon followed its fate. By the end of the month layoffs in local industries were expected and public confidence in the economy declined. Even the Star now recognized that it was "a time of financial disturbance and popular apprehension."[44]

The depression affected other local economies as early as September. Noting the widespread starvation among workers in Cincinnati, the Toledo press feared that millions of hard-working producers were becoming "an army of tramps and paupers." "With such scenes in a land where crops have been abundant, where nature has passed forth her richest treasures, where there is every indication of outward prosperity, there is evidently something deplorably wrong."[45] A month later the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, a powerful Republican organ, typically blamed the financial crisis on free trade and the Democrats. Whatever the cause, it fully acknowledged that "we do not have to go far from home to note hard times."[46] By the fall even the conservative Milwaukee Sentinel could not refute the existence of growing unemployment and widespread uncertainty.

The prevailing hard times forced many urban citizens to account for the widespread poverty that coexisted with obvious national wealth. Too many people were unemployed and actively searching for work to blame the situation on intemperance, laziness, or sinfulness, the traditional explanations for personal failure. There were claims and counterclaims on the extensiveness of the depression, but most social observers agreed that suffering was widespread and too great to be explained through personal deficiencies. The economic system seemed on the verge of total collapse, as conditions reached a crisis stage.[47]

By the autumn of 1893 half of Rochester's tailors and shoemakers were unemployed. Equally gloomy figures characterized the building trades. Since clothing production was central to Rochester's economy, the decline in sales caused by tight money and unemployment elsewhere greatly affected the shape of the local labor market. "The poor we have always with us," wrote Rev. William C. Gannett, a liberal Unitarian minister, "but this winter we have with us more than usual."[48] When a handful of jobs on municipal public works projects opened in early 1894, an "army of unemployed" stood in line hoping for the chance to earn their daily bread. Within a few months an estimated ten thousand workers were out of jobs, or one third of the entire labor market.[49]

Workers in Rochester and other cities fortunate enough to retain their jobs faced wage reductions and a precarious future. Charity workers increasingly had difficulty trying to separate tramps from the "respectable poor" who simply could not find work. Local judges, however, seemed to solve the problem by sentencing some of them to terms in the penitentiary and workhouse for vagrancy.[50] Without workman's compensation or adequate insurance, able bodied men and women often had to swallow their pride and accept various forms of private and public relief. Charity funds were frequently insufficient. The Rochester Humane Society cared for abused animals and people and early reported that "we find ourselves overwhelmed with work without the machinery, or the funds to successfully carry on."[51] The People's Rescue Mission on Front Street, which provided meals, lodging, and religious sermons in exchange for work on its rockpile, was unable to match the demand during the depression. Historian Blake McKelvey has revealed that more people received "theology and turkey" at the Mission during the Christmas of 1895 than ever before.[52]

Conditions in Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City were very similar. Approximately one third of Toledo's workers was unemployed in 1894, an unprecedented percentage in the city's history. The Blade would have preferred hiding the darker side of progress but finally ran front page stories on poverty by November of 1893. Already nearly 2,500 people received charitable relief, and 360 individuals on the average applied daily for food and medical assistance at the city infirmary, ten times the number of requests for the preceding year.[53] Moreover, everyone realized that distress was even more extensive. The majority of workers, of course, were not at death's door or aimlessly roaming the city streets, but thousands of citizens across the nation were too proud to accept outside assistance, historically a sign of pauperism. Toledo observers explained that many people "would rather die of hunger and cold than ask for food and clothing." Many citizens feared that pauper status would cause the state to intervene and remove their children from their care. "There are many who go hungry to bed...because they fear their children will be taken away from them, and they would rather do anything than be separated."[54]

Milwaukee suffered the same forms of economic dislocation as Rochester and Toledo. An estimated 35 to 40 percent of the working population was unemployed during the depths of the depression. Layoffs, reduced wages, and despair were the lot of many. David P. Thelen, for example, has shown that the Milwaukee County Poor List had varied from year to year but never exceeded several hundred families before the depression; it reached an unprecedented 3,420 families in the winter of 1894.[55] And, again, one cannot compute the deprivations of those whose pride stood in the way of asking for aid. As late as the 1930s, Emil Seidel, a wood carver who was Milwaukee's first Socialist mayor in 1910 and a product of his times, recalled the untold suffering of the period, even though he was lucky enough to hold his job. It was a familiar tale, for numerous radicals and moderate reformers alike acknowledged the effects of hard times on their social conscience.[56]

"Hard times is the cry of everybody nowadays," wrote the Kansas City Mail in the summer of 1893.[57] The Star agreed, saying that there was already "a tendency to speak of 'the unemployed' as of a permanent, recognized, and even organized class." "The air is vocal with the dismal voices of demogogues who talk as if this were Poland or Siberia."[58] While failing to identify these "demogogues," the editor accurately noted the rise of various forms of social discontent as the depression worsened. Like charity associations in other cities, the Provident Association continued to make fine distinctions between the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor, which meant that relief was selectively dispensed. Tramps who reportedly pretended to be honest workers temporarily unemployed were refused assistance and sent packing.[59] "Tramps now line the highways as they did the [depression] winter of 1874 and 1875," wrote one older citizen. "Walking commentaries on our vicious financial system."[60]

The obvious gap between rich and poor and the specter of class conflict and mob violence remained constant subjects of public discussion in these cities. Again, it was the atmosphere in which concerned men and women reconsidered their opinions on who benefitted from existing arrangements in school and society. Impoverished Italians and Hungarians who wandered along the canal towpath in Rochester were chased from the city or brought before the magistrate for vagrancy.[61] Urban police officers commonly escorted tramps and paupers to the edge of town. Tramps were always someone else's problem, and they otherwise comprised a constant drain on local charity funds.

Located relatively close to the Colorado coal and silver range, Kansas City was inundated with miners and other unemployed workers from surrounding states who sought jobs but instead faced policemen's billy clubs. One angry Kansas Citian complained of this unchristian treatment of fellow Americans. "When they reach Kansas City we send a squad of policemen to the railway yards to meet them and to tell them to get out of town...The poor fellows [then] ask for something to eat. They are coldly turned away; they are told the city has nothing for them. Was that humane?"[62]

Kansas City had enough trouble trying to find jobs for its own citizens. Within a few months after the onset of the depression, about 150 people without visible means of support slept every evening on the floor in the basement of the police station; as one group left another took its place. A job notice for fifty laborers attracted almost four thousand applicants. "Idle men, willing to work, stood in a long line for three blocks, waiting for a chance to secure employment." The foreman in charge of the hiring claimed it was "the biggest demonstration I ever saw."[63] The local Socialist Labor Party announced in the winter of 1895 that "never before in the history of mankind has there been so much suffering from hunger and privations of all kinds alongside of luxury and abundance of nature's gifts and the products of labor."[64] Poverty and progress marched arm in arm, though much of the suffering and pain was hidden in so many obscure news reports and in the proceedings of different civic meetings. Not all workers or citizens were miserable, impoverished, or converted to radicalism by these events, but for many the realities of urban existence were grim and uncertain.

The depression finally ended in 1897. Local newspapers like Rochester's Democrat and Chronicle hoped that the "calamity howlers" who had stirred up discontent would be silenced.[65] They were not. Many men and women who had never actively participated in social and educational reforms made their initial commitments to activism during these difficult years, and local cities were never quite the same. Women's clubs and suffrage leaders were expecially potent sources of innovation in every city. A Socialist trade union movement emerged in Milwaukee that gave it a radical heritage surpassing most municipalities. Kansas City's parents' and mothers' organizations tried to take power away from Superintendent Greenwood and an entrenched elite on the school board. Samuel M. Jones, a Toledo businessman and teetotaler turned Social Gospeler, hoped to reshape social and industrial relations along the lines of the Golden Rule. Little wonder, then, that some frustrated citizens threw up their arms in disgust and proclaimed: "This is the age of cranks."[66]

A Joiner Of Clubs

"Crankness" is the latest work, as applied to cranks of the female persuasion.
    Kansas City Mail, 1893

All hail! to the new woman, the pioneer of a social revolution. Let us open every field of labor to her invigorating presence, but let us not forget that nature is stronger than any creed or custom and that any woman is a possible center of domestic happiness and peace...Love is the power that rules this universe.
    Mary E. Law, Toledo club woman, 1899

I

"Once upon a time, in a beautiful city situated on Lake Michigan, there lived a little girl who was a perfect nuisance," recalled Lizzie Black Kander in a paper before the Wednesday Afternoon Club in Milwaukee in 1902:

> Time rolled on and on, this little girl grew and grew
> And then she married and still she grew--
> And the selfsame "spirits" that did simmer and brew
> And caused her teachers to fret and to stew
> Now bubbled and boiled and then overflew!!
> She crocheted wonderful tidies for sofa and chairs
> She made paper flowers for birthdays and fairs.
> She made noodles and struddles and knit sox by the pair
> And e'en sewed rag carpets for bedroom and stair.
> But, alas, things have changed, she sews carpets no more
> For her "spirits" have taken an upward soar.
> She's a Joiner of Clubs, Women's clubs by the score
> Oh, husband, fond husband, your fate we deplore!
> She settles grave matters--she tries to save souls
> And would you believe, she now votes at the polls![1]

Thus, with characteristic wit and good humor, Lizzie Kander chronicled her own rise as a "new" woman in the late nineteenth century. She personified the activism of many women who helped usher in an age of Progressive reform during the depression of the 1890s. Like so many of her generation, she helped propel women into the whirligig of municipal politics and social service reform: as Milwaukee's leading settlement house worker, a school board member for two decades, and an outspoken pacifist and champion of reform during the difficult days of World War I.

Living in a troubled but rapidly expanding urban and industrial society, activists like Kander occupied a crucial position in the evolution and implementation of early Progressive school reforms. Women's organizations that flourished on the grass roots unquestionably gave urban Progressivism much of its strength, stamina, and moral fervor. Once largely ignored by historians of the period, the women's club movement of the early twentieth century is typically highlighted in every new volume on women's history. One recent synoptic interpretation, for example, explains that women increasingly joined voluntary associations after the Civil War and that by 1900 "they turned more frequently to the state" as the key element in social policy.[2] While foreign commentators including Tocqueville had long recognized that Americans were joiners, something new was clearly underway in the Progressive era.

Greater recognition of the importance of women in Progressivism and of their advocacy of state intervention has not necessarily enhanced historical understanding of the dynamics of change. This is especially true in the area of school reform, where women's influence was highly visible. Even though women were influential sponsors of child welfare reforms, they faced numerous competing groups who also sought increased state intervention on behalf of youth. How did women's conception of the role of the state compare with that of labor unions, Socialist leaders, or businessmen and professionals on local school boards? What types of consensus and conflict existed between dominant women's organizations and elements of grass-roots reform? How did these disparate groups find themselves traveling on various roads to reform, all of which led to the expansion of the social functions of the modern school?

Contemporary analysts of social change at the turn of the century, like later historians, recognized women's prominence in educational reform but failed to explain where their influence began and ended compared with other groups. For example, in a popular text on school administration in 1908, two nationally respected educators, Samuel T. Dutton and David Snedden, argued that "perhaps no one factor has done more to give popular education a place in the thought of the community than the activity of women's clubs. These organizations, so numerous and so ernest, have both in their meetings at home and in their great federated gatherings always made education in its various forms their chiefest topic."[3] And, then and now, many individuals realized that women had a more pronounced role in school reform than ever before. Women's associations helped initiate many of the social welfare reforms that became commonplace in urban education; their members were the central figures in early discussions of the "new" education popularized on the national scene by John Dewey, Francis

Parker, and Joseph Mayer Rice; and they were continually forces to reckon with in local communities.

Organized women were an ever present factor in certain aspects of school decision making by the early twentieth century. Along with a number of other reform organizations they often cooperated with, they championed a wide range of innovations then considered advanced and "Progressive": vacation schools, playgrounds, social centers, school breakfasts and lunches, manual training and domestic science programs, parent-teacher associations, and a number of other programs. With the passage of school suffrage laws that affected cities like Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee (though not Kansas City), women served on school boards for the first time and finally shared power with men who had customarily viewed school governance as their exclusive domain. Women may have taught in the schools in overwhelming numbers, especially in the lower grades, but male ward leaders mostly controlled the urban schools of the nineteenth century. Between 1890 and 1920, as Lizzie Kander said, things changed, and the appearance of the new woman in the Nineties was a crucial element in the origins of municipal reform.[4]

Historians of Progressive educational reform often emphasize the importance of the "new middle class" school superintendents who augmented their power in educational policy through school board centralization reforms in the 1890s.[5] Considerably less has been written about the centrality of women and voluntary organizations in administrative and curricular reform. This is partially explained by the wide use of school reports and mainstream educational journals that often emphasized the importance of male administrators in initiating innovations. These materials served as the official record of the process of innovation; they often slighted the role of the private sector in educational experimentation and ignored much of the local context for reform. The history of school innovation during these years is integrally bound with the history of activist women, whose hopes and dreams and successes and failures are hidden in diverse kinds of local materials on school and society.

The ascent of the "new" woman to an influential though not dominant position in educational change was totally unexpected in places like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. It was as unexpected as the depression which accelerated the formation of competing voluntary associations and hence competing views on educational policy and the state. As a result of the depression, as well as the changing character of the middle and upper class household, new organizations developed that soon overshadowed the smaller and older literary women's clubs that already existed in these cities. The "society" women who dominated in these earlier groups promoted general intellectual improvement by studying poetry, history, philosophy, music, and art. They showed little interest in the larger concerns of the working world, favoring personal development over social reform. Their behavior mirrored perfectly the prevalent notion that politics--the rough and tumble by which public policy evolves--was exclusively for men, for one looks in vain in school proceedings before the 1890s for petitions by them or other indications of their interest in urban education. Milwaukee's superintendent reported in the 1870s that some women planned to investigate their schools, but then they were never heard from again.[6]

The Toledo Blade wrote in 1890 that the existing literary clubs were snobbish little affairs wholly divorced from the active life of the city. Even the many church related women's organizations, tied as they were to local neighborhoods, displayed more interest in social issues. The Milwaukee Sentinel likewise claimed in 1891 that locally "there are several 'sets' which carry on separate lines of social activity, and the members of each are quite satisfied with their own position and associates, and make no effort to get out of their own 'set' and into any other."[7] Society women on the East Side, like competing church groups, remained apart. The Kansas City Star likewise contended that women seemed unsuited for the strenuous life of politics. "Women, as a rule, have little taste for politics," claimed one of its editors. "The peace and quietude of the home present to them much stronger attractions than the excitement and turmoil of the public arena. They are not fitted by nature for contact with the world and participation in its strife and rivalry."[8] The editor could not have been more mistaken.

During the hard times emanating from the panic of 1893, women emerged as potent sources of social change and reform. Three years after the Blade attacked clubs for their elitism and pretentiousness, it asserted that "Toledo is becoming noted for the number and variety of its club organizations. Every one must have observed the rapid growth of the 'club spirit' within the past few years," which happily denoted the rise of "a broad, liberal metropolitan spirit."[9] In Rochester over forty clubs, most of them formed during the depression, organized into a Local Council of Women, causing one citizen to boast without evidence that "there is probably no other city of its size which supports more women's clubs."[10] Such statements stagnated through common use.

Like thriving newspapers in many cities, the Milwaukee Sentinel and its rival Daily News welcomed the arrival of the new women. Regular women's columns soon appeared in local papers, providing news for the curious and footnotes for future historians on the social and educational ideas of organized women. Women editors, who themselves often belonged to activist clubs, frequently reprinted speeches and addresses, information on membership dues, and the date, time, and location of the next meeting. Starting in October and running through June, the club season was the source of considerable controversy and news coverage throughout the Progressive era. Kansas City's newspapers, which previously dismissed the organizations and women's activism as a mere whim, now warned the school board to beware of women with fire in their eyes. "The school board need not invest in chest protectors or lay in a stock of revolvers," felt the working-class Mail, "but it may live in hourly expectation of a visitation nevertheless."[11]

The most important women's associations that agitated for school reform in the Progressive years assembled in the early 1890s. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union, modeled directly after organizations in Buffalo and other cities, early revolved around the dynamism of Susan B. Anthony, the national matriarch of the suffrage movement and one of Rochester's senior citizens. Formed in 1893, the Union was a direct descendant of the Ignorance Club, a self-effacing though elite literary group that had become Rochester's first modern woman's organization in 1880.[12] The Union was to Rochester what the Woman's Educational Club was to Toledo: the leading feminine organization for school reform. This Ohio club formed near the end of the depression, when local women vainly tried to elect a woman to the school board. Unity meant strength, wrote the Toledoan who defined the club as "the first weapon of primitive man" but "the last of Twentieth Century Woman."[13]

Milwaukee and Kansas City also had notable female organizations. The Woman's School Alliance was especially distinctive since it was the only club in all of Wisconsin that was solely interested in school affairs. First organized in 1891, the Alliance reassembled two years later when the depression impoverished thousands of Milwaukeeans; from an uncertain existence the group evolved into the most powerful woman's organization in the local schools. At the same time there emerged the Social Economics Club and numerous social reform groups that were active throughout the next three decades in this growing metropolis.[14] Similarly, Kansas City witnessed in 1894 the birth of the Athenaeum, whose name belied the non-literary interests that guided the group over the years. Moreover, every one of these cities had their first organized and permanent parent-teacher organizations in the 1890s; they were heavily dominated by women. By 1920 Kansas City was the world leader in parent-teacher organizations, with over 10,000 members.[15]

Except for the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee and local P.T.A.s, women's organizations were never exclusively concerned with school reform, though most of them held education as a dominant interest. Like all organizations, clubs had their own division of labor. Most of them had departments on education, literature, industrial change, domestic science, city beautification, and legislation. Many of the prominent activists in these cities aggressively sought women's suffrage. Susan B. Anthony, for example, formed early suffrage organizations in Rochester as well as in Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. Anthony was an exceptional figure but typified the zeal of lesser-known figures like Mary E. Law and Emily Bouton of Toledo.[16]

Many club activists found suffrage less attractive, yet these organizations provided every member with useful outlets from the restraints of the home. The club was a place of refuge from children and husbands and a means to discover one's hidden talents. The women's clubs and mothers' organizations became female community meeting places: friendships were strengthened, solitary individuals found fellowship, and everyone escaped from the narrowness of domestic life for a few hours. There were social teas and lectures, papers and informal discussions. Here one could gossip about trivial matters as well as unite for a new school activity. Here women who were unaccustomed to public speaking overcame some of their shyness. And here, too, many first confronted the contradiction of progress and poverty, an experience that often proved exhilarating. For these reasons a club like the Kansas City Athenaeum quickly mushroomed from a few dozen members in 1894 to several hundred women and was called the local "women's university."[17]

The personal motivations behind these joiners of clubs were immensely complex and varied though not inscrutable. For example, Lizzie Black Kander was a member of the Woman's School Alliance and Milwaukee's leading settlement worker. She was driven by a mixture of intense idealism, love for the poor, and fear for her middle-class Jewish standing. The child of Jewish immigrants who secured a comfortable livelihood in Milwaukee, Kander was moved by the spectacle of immense human suffering and the gap between rich and poor which accompanied nineteenth-century progress. Speaking to her classmates at her high school graduation exercises in 1878, she called for public control over the industrial giants to procure social welfare. "The wealth of the nation is in the hands of a few individuals who are accumulating more every day, while the poor are becoming more and more miserable," she bluntly argued. "We are forgetting that truth, honesty, virtue, and love are far more valuable to the happiness of mankind than extravagant modes of living."[18]

With such a strong conviction in support of social justice so early in her life, it is not surprising that Kander's speeches, correspondence, and settlement house reports over the next several decades revealed an intense concern with the victims of industrial progress. At the same time she acknowledged that helping others was simultaneously a form of self advancement. She feared that the thousands of poor Russian Jews who inhabited late nineteenth-century Milwaukee would hurt the reputations of assimilated Jews like herself; she was also frightened by the prospects of new outbreaks of anti-Semitism of the sort her parents had once faced.[19] In the 1880s she thereupon joined a Jewish Ladies' Sewing Society to mend tattered clothes for recent immigrants. Together with the School Alliance in the 1890s she gathered shoes and clothes for underprivileged school children and also began a "Keep Clean Mission" in the densest Jewish immigrant neighborhood to teach cleanliness and morality. This Mission soon evolved into her locally renowned Settlement House.[20]

Kander was popularly known as the "Jane Addams of Milwaukee." Even critics who thought her liberalism and pacifism were tainted by some of her Socialist friends said she had "a heart big enough to mother every child in town."[21] It was a compliment she could appreciate. She spent decades as a school board member agitating for new social service programs in the public schools, programs like penny lunches and supervised playgrounds. She demonstrated the efficacy of these programs for the children of the poor at the settlement and increasingly viewed them as desirable objects of public policy for all children. Remarkably honest about her own fears of a threatened loss of social status, she tried to reeducate others about the social rather than personal origins of immigrant poverty. "The people are really not to blame, they are the result of tyranny & oppression, of the persecutions that have been heaped upon them from generation to generation," Kander always noted.[22]

A confirmed teetotaler, Kander respected the social role of the saloon in working-class life and attacked temperance agitators and those who endorsed immigrant restriction. In defending immigrant lifestyles from bigots and extreme Americanizers she partially transcended some of her own middle-class prejudices.[23] Her preoccupation with the immigrant poor also made her marriage to a realtor a very difficult one, especially in the early years in the 1890s, since her husband wanted his wife at home. Finding little moral support at home, Kander confided in her diary. One entry in 1895 registered her dismay that "my husband hates to have me speak or think much about...the poor little children & their mothers" at the Mission.[24]

Personal information on the lives of other women similarly demonstrates the sometimes highly individualistic reasons for participation in service groups. While younger women like Kander represented the newer generation of female activists, Progressive women's organizations also contained many older suffrage leaders who used the clubs in part as possible vehicles for full citizenship. Susan B. Anthony was already in her seventies when she helped form Rochester's Women's Educational and Industrial Union. She agitated for the group along with younger suffrage leaders like Helen B. Montgomery, an irrepressible reformer who became the first woman school board member in Rochester in 1900.[25]

Miss Anthony had joined temperance groups, lobbied with labor organizations, and even gone on trial in the 1870s when she cast her ballot in a local election. When found guilty of voting, this highly principled woman refused to pay the fine and was given a suspended sentence.[26] For Anthony as well as thousands of less famous women, suffrage and broadened roles for women in higher education and society generally were, in their words, matters of "simple justice." Service clubs were a means to that end. Rosa Segur, a pioneer suffrage worker, German immigrant, and prominent club woman in Toledo in the Nineties, typically interpreted school suffrage as a "crumb" but agreed with many that legislation and clubwork aided in the struggle for full citizenship.[27]

Particularistic motivations notwithstanding, women for the first time were able to escape from the restrictiveness of the home, particularly the middle and upper class homes from which many club members came. The rise of labor-saving devices which they could afford and the declining birth rate over the nineteenth century freed many comfortable women from the fireside, physically if not emotionally. Middle and upper class women benefitted enormously from their release from mundane domestic responsibilities. The availability of prepackaged and prepared foods, improved water supplies, electric lighting, and rudimentary washing machines revolutionized their homes, as a consumer phase of capitalism emerged in the late nineteenth century.[28] House work remained largely women's work, but the clubs they formed became bridges to the larger society, and it often took an act of bravery to cross them.

Helen B. Montgomery of Rochester epitomized the outspoken nature of the new woman. The perennial President of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, she was a social gadfly by the 1890s. A popular public speaker, she spoke to labor organizations, Socialist groups, and other voluntary associations on an assortment of topics. On more than one occasion Montgomery was attacked as a Socialist since she endorsed the national ownership of the utilities and condemned the conspicuous consumption and antisocial behavior of the Vanderbilts. Real Socialists, of course, quickly pointed out that she was not a member of their party. Yet one of Rochester's leading Socialist radicals still defended her from abuse in 1897 and praised her for her spunk and "keen insight into economic injustice."[29]

Montgomery boldly attacked the local curmudgeons who commonly complained that club work ruined the value of many housewives. "We are tired of the flabby philosophy that there was something unwomanly in any matters outside our own doorsteps," she retorted. "The time is past when women are content to play with dolls, or devote themselves to their little calling list, and the association of a few social friends."[30] Montgomery's allies in the Women's Educational and Industrial Women, like women across the country, similarly defended the existence of the clubs and their role in educating their minds and broadening their social views. Mrs. William C. Gannett, who was the wife of a liberal minister, typically asserted that "the club not only widens the horizon, but tends to openminded and good tempered discussion of widely divergent opinions."[31]

Women in various cities emphasized the value of the clubs in furthering self-awareness and understanding a changing social life. One of Toledo's prominent club women, Mary E. Law, ran a local kindergarten training school and narrowly lost in her bid for election to the school board in the Nineties. For her and many others the clubs were invaluable, despite recurrent disappointments at the polls. "The club woman," she claimed, "has found that breadth of culture comes from the association from women of different classes and pursuits and that selfishness and exclusiveness tend to narrowness and provincialism."[32]

Everywhere Progressive women agreed. In their clubs women debated the merits of the tariff, free trade, Socialism, child labor laws, suffrage, and other timely subjects. Many shy women grew in self-confidence as they engaged in debate and discussion with their cohorts. Invited speakers, both men and women, introduced novel ideas into the lives of the club members, challenging old perspectives and offering fresh perspectives on contemporary problems. Because of the social and personal benefits, millions of housewives ultimately joined turn-of-the-century women's clubs. It was, of course, an age of organization, from the business monopolies above to the trade unions below who fought for control over the work process and the fruits of production. Now women formed an additional force which could possibly shape local politics and the direction of social institutions. In 1890 organized women were an insignificant factor in urban educational policy. For the next three decades, however, they influenced every important administrative change, curricular reform, and social service established in local cities. The history of urban school reform in the Progressive era became inextricably related to the history of this women's movement.

II

Through various means women were locked out of the political process of school decision making in the early 1890s. In Kansas City they lacked the right of school suffrage. Wisconsin permitted school suffrage for women, but Milwaukee's school board was appointed by male aldermen. In Toledo and Rochester, where the boards of education were elective, the male-dominated Republican and Democratic caucuses controlled ward nominations, so school suffrage was weakened as an instrument for positive change. Women's clubs therefore became the collective arm of thousands of reform minded citizens whose political dependence on men otherwise sapped their strength. If women could not vote, wrote one Kansas Citian, the mothers "will demand to be heard from in a different way, and the school board may discover to its horror what way it is. The mothers will arrive probably with blood in their eyes."[33]

What remained uncertain in the Nineties was not whether women would organize, for the prominence of their associations was a matter of public record. There was common agreement that "this is an era of organizations--of clubs, societies, and associations, devoted to purposes the number and scope of which are bewildering."[34] The main issue was how women--even middle and upper class women--could justify greater participation in a male-dominated world, retain their socially conditioned feminine and domestic traits, and use the powers of the state for public good. This required a convincing and acceptable platform of reform, one which enabled women to venture beyond the seclusion of the home and to question the validity of the existing educational order. By the end of the Nineties the die had finally been cast.

To comprehend fully the zeal with which women promoted social service reforms like vacation schools, playgrounds, breakfasts and lunches, social centers, medical inspection, and other forms of state intervention in children's welfare in the Progressive era requires an understanding of the ideology of this women's movement. Club women were not disinterested reformers but acted upon a coherent body of ideals that, as we shall later see, varied greatly from the beliefs of organized workers, trade union leaders, Socialists, Populists, Social Gospelers, and other Progressive reformers. Nearly all grass-roots Progressives found themselves on a road to greater state involvement in schooling and welfare, yet different groups traveled alternate routes to their common destination. Most organized women did not share the daily experiences of the skilled workers facing monopoly capitalism, or the vision of a Heaven on Earth that inspired Social Gospelers, or the Socialist faith in the coming of a fundamentally new social order. Some women would indeed be greatly affected by these considerations as reform movements gathered momentum in local cities, yet they had to resolve their own contradictions: how to be feminine and domestic while being politically active, how to defend the home while espousing more state intervention in family life, how to cater to the perceived needs of the poor even though they were not poor themselves.

The creation of a new form of domesticity was the heart of the ideological world constructed and inhabited by Progressive women. Women did not ordinarily refer to themselves as "citizens" or "taxpayers" in their petitions to the school board, as their male counterparts so often did; more frequently, they invoked the image of parent or mother to justify their meddling in men's affairs. Hence they used a seemingly traditional faith in the power of motherhood as the cutting edge for social activism. The General Federation of Women's Clubs, which was the national organization that united thousands of women's associations from every state, was popularly known as that "Great Mothers' Organization."[35] The forerunner of the modern PTA was the National Congress of Mothers, which assembled in the final days of the depression in 1897. And from national journals of opinion to local publications like the Toledo _Blade_, one found the common statement that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world."[36] Or at least _should_ rule the world. Motherhood became the war cry of those who met face to face with the male ward bosses who controlled the urban school.

The nineteenth-century consensus that women's place was in the home was gradually reinterpreted in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. In the past the belief that women were the defenders of the purity and safety of the home was sufficient justification for denying them a place in city politics. By the turn of the century, subtle changes in women's interpretation of domesticity helped propel them to larger involvement in municipal life. Women in the vanguard of urban educational reform advanced the age-old argument that they had special talents in child nurture. Now, however, they altered the meaning of domesticity to justify leaving the home and engaging in many public activities. What the new woman opposed was not domesticity but a static interpretation of women's rights and duties. In the rural past, when the processes of production and distribution centered in the home, it was argued, mothers could best protect the home by remaining near the fireside. Because of urban and industrial transformation, parental control over the children's food, clothing, and schooling was diminished, necessitating corresponding changes in maternal behavior. Motherhood now meant expanding the home's boundaries to include the entire community.

The new woman often sounded like an old woman in her platitudes on the wonders of motherhood, thereby disguising genuine changes in women's ideology and often the class dimensions of feminine reform. "A partnership with God is motherhood," claimed the elite West Side Mothers' Club in Milwaukee. "What strength, what purity, what self-control."[37] Despite time-honored assertions, women were nevertheless changing their actual social practice and reaching out in new ways to school and city. By expanding the definition of the home to include more than an individual household, urban women proved that homemaking and social activism were not incompatible but part of a domestic continuum. "The environment of every woman is the home, wherever she goes she carries this with her," wrote the President of the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs in 1900.

"The time has come, however, when it is not enough that woman should alone be a home-maker, she must take the world itself a larger home."[38] Since external forces produced and controlled the basic amenities of life, from the food and water to the clothes, heat, and light, modern motherhood necessitated expanding the four walls of the home out into the street until they reached city hall.

Home-like metaphors dotted the speeches and writings of municipal club women. Helen Montgomery of Rochester characteristically interpreted widened opportunities for reform as a prerequisite for sound motherhood and citizenship. "It is not enough that the house is kept clean, if the street be wrong, and the ward unhealthful," she asserted in an interview in the Democrat and Chronicle in 1896. "There should be a broadened housekeeping, to extend out of doors and all over the city. All these things will help women to gain full enfranchisement."[39] "What rights do mothers have in regard to the public school education of their children?" asked some angry representatives of the local Political Equality Club to the ward leaders on the school board.[40] When they learned that they only had the right to vote for school commissioners--who were always men since the party caucuses were male-dominated--the women quickly retorted that modern mothers could only ensure children's welfare if they stepped beyond their own front door.

The Woman's Suffrage Association of Toledo, whose roots extended back to the 1870s, was revitalized in the Nineties when new legislation gave women the right to vote on school issues and serve on boards of education. Its members argued that modern motherhood required women to vote to defeat the ward bosses. As the Blade revealed in 1894, these activists had started to attract women to their meetings who "had probably never attended a suffrage meeting, and had never publicly expressed any opinion on public affairs."[41] While moving out of the traditional home sphere, these women were slowly refashioning their domestic identity.

Mrs. John Kumler, for example, demanded at one of these meetings that "she should be allowed to vote because she did not think it right or just that her influence over her children should end at her doorstep. She desires to vote especially on school affairs, that school officers shall be elected, who are qualified to act in the best interests of the youth of the city."[42] In response to those who believed that voting and larger involvement in social and political life were unfeminine, an unmarried suffrage activist responded that "the true woman is no less womanly, no less conscientious, in the performance of her home duties...than the woman of a hundred years ago, though the expression of this devotion may wear a different aspect."[43]

Women indeed expressed their devotions in new ways. They often notified men in every city that they refused to stay home and out of public view. Mrs. Charles B. Whitnall, a liberal reformer who later joined the Socialist Party, announced with other members of the Milwaukee Woman's School Alliance that "ours is a great work in a never-ending cause, a cause which will never die so long as a child lives on this big earth."[44] However much women disagreed on total suffrage and the Socialist movement, club women were inseparable on issues related to school reform and the welfare of urban youth. Historians have always emphasized that the Progressive era discovered the adolescent, but the interests of reformers in youth ranged across all of their age levels to adulthood. Certainly the education of the children of the poor and of immigrants of all ages in addition to adolescense was a preeminent contemporary concern. At any rate, the new domesticity was steeped in images of mothers' role in child nurture, home care, and schooling. "Nine-tenths of the work they have undertaken," wrote the historian of the women's club movement in 1910, "relates to children, the school, and the home."[45]

By continually emphasizing their insights as parents and mothers in child welfare and education, many club women assumed that they were morally superior to men. They perceived themselves as an uncorruptible, purifying force that would cleanse urban politics and overturn the rule of immoral men. Dr. Mary Munson, a new woman from Toledo, advanced the usual position in 1894 that women had historically borne the burdens of the "philanthropic work of the world." "When she enters the arena of politics she will not be untrue to her woman's nature. Laying aside partisanship, she will rise to the full dignity of her responsibilities as the mother of the race."[46] However much their actions weakened their claim of non-partisanship, women persistently argued that they were immune from base political aims and always represented the higher interests of the child.

Women were the healers, the guardians of children, and the protectors of hearth and home. Like women's groups elsewhere, the Woman's School Alliance in its constitution emphasized "the great and good influence that women may exert in a community."[47] And everywhere it was assumed that women could rise above personal prejudices and class background to secure the common good. "Women would vote more directly for what would concern the highest interests of the schools without regard to politics or to party," argued one suffrage leader, who somehow ignored the fact that women's organizations were intensely political and in the vanguard of new and controversial educational ideas.[48] Another female reformer more sensibly asserted that even if women could not purify urban government, an unlikely occurrence, certainly "women cannot make politics any worse than men have done."[49]

The new domesticity, therefore, provided necessary ideological justifications for women to broaden their housekeeping responsibilities. That did not mean that this automatically convinced male politicians to share power with them. As a result women usually found themselves forming alliances not with the men on the school board but with the females who predominated on the teaching staff. Club women assulted the system on two fronts: they pressured ward leaders to adopt their experimental programs in the schools and also struggled to build alliances with neighborhood teachers. Though not uncritical of the prevalence of singsong teaching methods and the liberal use of corporal punishment in the schools, organized women championed better working conditions for women laboring in the classroom. Women's groups throughout the Progressive era were in the forefront of efforts to increase teacher's salaries, reduce class sizes, and bring parents and teachers into closer association.

Every prominent woman's club interested in social service had an active school visitation committee. The educational committees of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, the Women's Educational Club of Toledo, the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee, and the Athenaeum of Kansas City were comprised of volunteers who visited the schools and tried to establish close ties with neighborhood teachers. These visitors were thorns in the sides of many ward commissioners, but they laid the basis for modern parent teacher associations. School officials throughout the nineteenth century had urged greater school and home cooperation. Women now took matters into their own hands with little encouragement from the educational establishment. They investigated everything in the schools from the cleanliness of the floors to the numbers of children per classroom. They ultimately formed a gallery-like assembly at many school board meetings in the Nineties.[50]

One reason why many of the organizations from the Nineties survived for so many decades was that many of their members were former teachers. Fired from their jobs upon marriage (for, as it was said, domestic obligations took precedence over careers), they nevertheless retained a keen interest in schooling. Club women therefore had considerable empathy for the urban school teacher, whose plight was once theirs. In that way, middle and upper class women could partially transcend their current class position by fighting for better working conditions for their less favored sisters. Without tenure or guaranteed job security, teachers could be removed from office for almost any reason, and marriage precluded the continuation of their teaching careers. Class sizes still hovered above fifty per class in the lower grades with low pay as a reward, so teachers often sorely needed friends on the outside of the schools who could sustain them in their arduous jobs. More systematic attention was now given to the plight of the local teacher than ever before.[51]

The prominence of former teachers or wives of current male teachers in these women's clubs helped cement stronger bonds between home and school. Since many of these former teachers were now mothers, they took an even greater interest in the welfare of the schools. Of the fifty women on the educational committee of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in Rochester, most were mothers and former teachers who used their experiences to engage in neighborhood reform. The Union characteristically held its meetings on weekends to accommodate the maximum number of teachers who attended its conferences.[52] Former and current teachers were well represented on the Women's Educational Club of Toledo and the Athenaeum of Kansas City. Mary E. Law of Toledo, for example, was a native Toledoan, a former grade school teacher, and then the founder of a local kindergarten training school. When club women and suffragettes complained to local school boards, they based their criticisms on personal experiences and recent contact with actual school conditions.[53]

A brief examination of the backgrounds of the members of the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee drawn from the earliest membership data available in 1897 reveals some of the social origins of voluntary group membership. Formed in 1891 and reorganized two years later, the Alliance was the outgrowth of a series of "Mothers Meetings" that some literary club members organized in the 1880s. Throughout the Progressive era the Alliance was in the thick of educational debate and innovation, championing a number of social welfare reforms. Like organizations in other cities, the Alliance applauded the work of women in school reform. The preamble to its constitution stated that the Alliance's chief concern was with "investigating conditions, studying methods of instruction, and promoting the best interests of our Public Schools."[54]

Clubs like the Alliance often regarded themselves as "representative" organizations. Under closer scrutiny the backgrounds of members assume greater clarity, revealing the basis for the growing connections between home and school. Of the 170 members in 1897, 155 have been uncovered in the city directory. Teachers

(17 percent) and the wives of male teachers (9 percent) formed 28 percent, or almost one-third of the entire membership; they constituted the largest segment of the association. The next largest groups included the wives of businessmen and manufacturers (20 percent), professionals like physicians, lawyers, and dentists (17 percent), agents and salesmen (8 percent), and realtors (7 percent). The wives of skilled workers (hatters, brass finishers, painters, etc.) formed 10 percent of the organization.[55]

Exactly how many of these members were former teachers is unknown, but the Alliance continually pushed for better ties with local schools and physical and educational improvements in the poorer neighborhoods. Alliance members were primarily from the elite East Side, the traditional source of literary club membership, and the working-class South Side. The most prominent teachers who were members worked in some of Milwaukee's poorest areas, inhabited largely by unskilled Poles. One very active member of the Alliance was Mary F. Flanders, who was the principal and former teacher at the Jones Island School. A close friend and supporter of Lizzie Kander, Flanders regularly blasted the school administration for the unsanitary, rickety, understaffed facility in her district.[56]

Jones Island was an impoverished area inhabited by Germans and Poles, many of whom were employed as fishermen. Photographs of the area from the turn of the century show closely-packed, tenement-like houses hugging the Lake Michigan shore. Miss Flanders championed better home and school relations, supported several successful parent associations in the mid-Nineties, and continually lobbied for local improvements. Many of the teachers in the Alliance similarly worked in poor neighborhoods, for although the ward system in theory promised to serve each district equally, the schools in the poorest areas, especially near the South Side, were almost always the most understaffed, overcrowded, and least aesthetically pleasing. Many of the Alliance members did not have to worry about losing their jobs when they complained to the school board, yet enough teachers and wives of male teachers were members to ensure that their petitions were based on thorough knowledge of local conditions. School visitors, if not the area children, always did their homework.[57]

Members of the Woman's School Alliance and other organizations openly defended parents' and mothers' rights as well as those of the teacher. They were sensitive to the problem of determining how to unite parent and teacher in the best interests of the child. A member of the Women's Ethical Club in 1896 caused a stir in Rochester when she told a principal that "often teachers forget that the first allegiance of the child is to its parents, and while parents may not in all cases keep up with the times...their opinion should always be listened to with the greatest deference in the presence of the child."[58]

In this instance the principal retorted that teachers and principals disliked interference and meddling by parents. Despite such disagreements, relations between Rochester women's groups and teachers in the Nineties always seemed cordial; the school board's claim that school visitors would be regarded by teachers as spies was unfounded. When a leading school commissioner attacked the teaching staff in 1898 for trying to control textbook selection, a perennial source of graft from the book companies, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union quickly defended the teachers for asserting their rights against the all male school board.[59]

Such outspoken behavior was a reflection of the Progressive woman's new ideology of domesticity. Identifying strongly with their parental and maternal traits, women broadened their conceptions of home responsibilities and tried to foment an educational awakening among the citizenry. The quest for what the Kansas City Athenaeum called a "wider educational spirit" in the community continued throughout the 1890s. The Citizens Educational Association of Rochester sounded like so many other organizations when it tried "to encourage every other means of popular education, to bring about needed reforms in the admininistration of school affairs, and to maintain an active interest among the people in the matter of general education."[60] Women club members were critical of traditional teaching methods, excessive discipline, and other non-progressive elements of schooling. In these and other ways they tried to energize large numbers of people behind the cause of reform.

Women wanted to cooperate with teachers as well as to focus attention on the rights of parents and children. When teachers ignored these rights, they were occasionally chastized, sometimes severely. "One of the strongest criticisms against our public schools is the total ignoring of the rights of children and parents when they come in question with those of teachers," complained one of Toledo's leading suffrage leaders.

> The axiom of many Toledo school teachers is: "The King can do no wrong, I am the King." When parents have appealed to members of the board of education, their grievances have usually been turned over to the teachers' committee, under whom parents' rights have almost always been nil.[61]

This grievance was penned in the heat of battle between local women and the male school board. It was unusually critical in its tone and atypical of female reformers' attitudes toward schoolmarms. But its extreme stance reflected the frustration of those who were through various means barred from public office and who feared that their control over children ended when they passed through the school house door.

For the most part women's clubs were sympathetic to teachers though eager to transform the schools along the lines of the "new education," a phrase coined in earlier decades but increasingly a goal of reform organizations in the Nineties. Their quarrel was less with teachers, who they realized would be essential allies in any progressive campaign, than with the male power brokers who implemented programs and guided school policy. Soon these joiners of clubs boldly confronted ward bosses, superintendents, and the leading men of the city. Women's ability to portray themselves as simply mothers defending the home belied their talents as outspoken political agitators and obscured their role in expanding state responsibility for social welfare.

III

By the mid-nineties organized women were already firmly convinced that modern housekeeping necessitated updated ideas on domesticity. When they entered the male domain of school politics, however, they quickly learned that Progressive school reform would be difficult and would require more than appeals to the new motherhood. In Kansas City, which had a small, elite school board elected at large, women lacked school suffrage, so they had to pressure male leaders to implement their ideas. Although the Milwaukee school board was based on ward lines and Wisconsin women enjoyed school suffrage, the local board was appointed by the all male city council, which had little interest in the women's movement. The prospects for Rochester and Toledo women seemed brighter since their ward-based school boards were elective and women enjoyed suffrage on school matters. The major rub was that the Republican and Democratic machines controlled the nominating process, and the local politicians never nominated women. Women were frustrated at every turn.

Women refused to despair despite these obvious roadblocks. They firmly believed in themselves and mustered the courage to confront unexpected challenges. Organized women and civic minded mothers were regularly insulted for their harebrained educational ideas, told to go home and wash their dishes, and leave the rarified atmosphere of school administration to wiser men. Club women nevertheless refused to withdraw from the public arena; they stood their ground and squarely faced their opponents. They visited the local schools, discussed the latest educational ideas, and even funded some experimental programs at the settlement houses like lunches, playgrounds, and vacation schools. When permission was granted, they ultimately ran many of these programs in selected neighborhood schools. They formed mothers' clubs with kindergarten teachers who were imbued with Froebel's faith in the moral superiority of motherhood. Starting from a weak power base, the new woman helped bring the new education to many cities.[62]

The new education directly challenged the basic tenents of nineteenth century pedagogy. In its earliest years in the Nineties the new education emphasized individuality, mild forms of discipline, and an end to excessive memorization, recitation, and testing; it also endorsed the addition of innovative subjects like manual training, domestic science, kindergartens, and nature study. Like most of the subjects already in the school, these subjects were once the responsibility of the home, but organized women and reformers in general called for new forms of municipal intervention in the lives of youth. They believed that the state should have a larger parenting role in social welfare, a natural position for anyone guided by theories of expansive motherhood.[63]

Searching for different ways to expand their power beyond their own homes, organized women found countless outlets for their activities during the depression. Despite all the boosterism that informed the public literature of the period, the contradictions of progress and poverty were everywhere apparent as large numbers of able bodied people were denied work. The old, the weak, and the destitute were in special need during these difficult times, yet women turned again and again to the child, not only to their children but especially to the children of the poor. As one Rochesterian put it, there was now a "growing realization of the value of the maternal spirit in society--the concern of all for the good of all mothers and children." "It is no longer my child, his rights, his comforts--but the rights and comforts of all children," since "what concerns my neighbor's child, concerns me; a wrong or injustice to childhood anywhere in the city touches every mother in the city."[64]

Growing parental criticisms of the educational establishment surfaced in the most unlikely places. Even before the depression had affected local cities and before Joseph Mayer Rice or John Dewey had written their famous essays and books on the new education, ordinary parents in places like Kansas City had attacked the worst aspects of local schooling. In late December, 1892, an unnamed parent wrote a critical letter to the editor of the conservative and Republican Journal of Commerce, the booster paper made famous by Robert T. Van Horn. Soon a raging controversy flared between parents and Superintendent James Greenwood. At first slightly deferential to the school administration, the letters became so strident that the editor refused to publish them after several weeks. Out of the debate came some of the earliest stirrings of Progressive reform.[65]

Parents complained in a series of letters of their dissatisfaction with the school system. They were particularly incensed by the system's emphasis on rigid discipline and rote memorization in the classroom and their effects on children's health. One parent cited an outbreak of the St. Vitus Dance, a nervous disease which reportedly resulted from the "daily routine and gadgrind" and the constant "worry over school lessons."[66] Others complained about the constant grading and testing and the ubiquitous forms required when children were tardy or absent. When one child complained that "I got ten demerit marks this forenoon just because I didn't keep my eyes in one certain place," it angered his mother and her neighbors. "Every child in the school seems to be a machine. If one asserts any individuality he gets demerit marks in 'form,' and his promotion is endangered...Is that education, which leaves the child's individuality undeveloped, or crushes it out altogether? Should our schools make automatons, educationally, of our boys and girls?"[67]

Superintendent Greenwood was never afraid to state his opinions locally on any number of subjects. He never hid in the shadows or avoided a confrontation. On the contrary, he strutted through town impeccably dressed with top hat and cane as he made his rounds from school to school. He was a sight not easily forgotten. He was also impatient with outside criticism and privately called Francis Parker, John Dewey, and other innovators fools.[68] The Kansas City school board gave Greenwood almost full reign in administering the schools during his forty years at the helm. He had an interesting way of dealing with parents: he attacked them when they seemed apathetic or else attacked them when they disagreed with him. He always deflected criticism on him or the system back upon the parents themselves. Only when one letter appeared which likened the schools to military drill--with "eyes front," "hands erect," and "hands folded"--did Greenwood decide to enter the current fray.[69]

Greenwood blasted parents for not appreciating the value of military form as a central part of "character training." During emergencies like fires, parents would certainly applaud "instant obedience and military movement" which would "save lives and prevent the disastrous trampling of a mob." Moreover, discipline, corporal punishment, and toeing the line (that is, the lines formed by wooden floors) prepared children for the rough and tumble of the competitive world. Greenwood then calculated the exact number of hours children spent at home instead of at school, supposedly proving that parents were primarily responsible for such maladies as the St. Vitus Dance.[70]

Greenwood's blunt rejoinder inflamed local debate. An "anxious mother" responded that "the dissatisfaction regarding the surplus amount of red tape used is widespread." Children were forced to learn long lists of words in exact order, recite them accordingly, or get marked down. There were "pencil raps" and lowered deportment grades when children innocently stretched their arms and turned their heads.[71] Some mothers called for school suffrage laws to eliminate the unresponsive male administration. Others pointed out that the teachers, who were the victims of considerable negative publicity, were themselves victims of the system; they were forced to crush "the natural abandon of eager, happy children" as a matter of survival. Teachers preserved "order" to preserve their jobs, and the feminine qualities of love and kindness toward children were transformed into rigid methods of instruction.[72] Teachers themselves added that through their exposes parents had "struck the nail on the head." Without tenure provisions, however, even sympathetic teachers were powerless to change the system. Critical teachers were platooned by Greenwood to schools on the outer edges of the city.[73]

Calls for greater freedom for teachers and individual attention for pupils were difficult requests in such overcrowded schools, but Greenwood and the school board never accepted these ideas as legitimate concerns. They controlled the schools and used the major political parties to isolate themselves from outside critics. Nominations to the school board were manipulated by a bipartisan clique of Republicans and Democrats, a plan that Greenwood had personally arranged in 1880.[74] This clique had little respect for the women's movement. Only the working class Mail was friendly toward new educational ideas and "soft" pedagogy. In late 1892 it championed women's rights, parental involvement in the schools, and questioned elite dominance on the school board. But the paper itself fell victim to the depression. It went into receivership, changed ownership, and ultimately became an outspoken critic of labor unions, socialism, and liberalism.[75]

The Kansas City Star recognized the potential transforming force of the new ideas presented by local parents in the rival Journal of Commerce. After considering them the Star concurred with the conservative school administration. Its editorial written during the heat of the educational debate spoke volumes:

> What has become of the old fashioned youth who pursued an education with patient search and vigil long, who did not mind poor clothes and bare feet; who was willing to sit on any kind of bench...who laid prone on his stomach and read by the light of the fire till far into the night; who would walk miles in snow or rain to borrow a book and as far to return it? Where has he gone? In his place, with all the modern facilities, with fine school houses and patent furniture and furnaces, and cabinets and blackboards, maps and charts, there has come another who complains of "nerves" and "St. Vitus Dance" and for whom fears are entertained lest he learns too much.[76]

With the press, the politicians, and the school administration united against them, mothers and sympathetic parents turned inward and formed the largest network of parent teacher associations in the world by 1920.

Women had similar problems with the school administration in Milwaukee. The appointed, ward-based school board formed a phalanx against the Woman's School Alliance and the new education. Only a handful of men broke ranks and supported the women. Alliance members regularly attended school board meetings in the Nineties, where they petitioned for better sanitary methods, the adoption of manual training and domestic science, nature study, and the abolishment of corporal punishment. Many of their programs were aimed at freeing children from some of the book-oriented aspects of schooling and at providing more activity-oriented programs for hand and eye coordination and muscle development. These innovations were neither class biased nor trade oriented, for when many of them were finally adopted in some form after the turn of the century they were found in every elementary school. In the Nineties, however, the Alliance specifically championed the needs of the poorest districts of the city.[77]

Like many urban women's groups, the Alliance focused on many problems related to school sanitation in the Nineties. A few months after the Alliance organized, its school visitors surveyed sanitary conditions in the entire city, like all municipal housekeepers who promoted better health for all school children. Visitors discovered that the poorest districts were also the areas with the highest levels of unsanitary conditions and infant mortality. The worst environment in their opinion was at "the Seventeenth district school at Bay View, which is located near the nail mill and puddling mill of the Illinois Steel Company" on the South Side. Obnoxious fumes "and great volumes of black smoke filled the air" of the classrooms "almost constantly" during their visits.[78] Alliance members correspondingly demanded that the men on the school board correct these vile conditions.

The Alliance had even more complaints about the Tenth District School. Located in one of the most densely populated, working-class sections of Milwaukee, the school had a ventilating system whose intake ducts were located over "privy vaults and manure heaps." The "disgusting odors" were so bad that "even the janitor cannot endure to remain at his post," wrote the Alliance. "The teachers are pale and languid and assert that their rooms are filled with deadly microbes. The rooms of the younger children are directly over vile closets, and it is the greatest wonder that some epidemic does not break out among them."[79] The school was so overcrowded that some classes met in the cloak rooms. For their concerns with children in the poorer districts, the Alliance received many pledges of support but even more red tape. The women were routinely told to pressure the city council, which funded the school board, or to harass the Board of Public Works, which was technically responsible for school repairs.

The Woman's School Alliance was such a protean source of new ideas that the President of the school board labeled them "impetuous" and fellow committee members who responded to their frequent charges called their reports "misleading and incorrect" and "their suggestions impracticable."[80] Board members never successfully refuted their reports, though they often dismissed them, and it would have admittedly been difficult for any school board to implement their ideas rapidly in the hard times of the Nineties. The Alliance demanded the abolishment of corporal punishment, which was refused even though it did not involve money but differences between advocates of stern and "gentle" measures of correction. The Alliance also desired more pay for elementary teachers, adjustable desks for all new schools, playgrounds, sewing classes, manual training, and more kindergartens. It was permitted to run some experimental programs and to hold its meetings in various local schools, which in the long run provided an inroad for those who later championed the use of schools as social centers. The Alliance's successes were modest, for it presented new ideas to a body of men who were satisfied with the old ways.[81]

Largely as a result of the support given to the women's cause by influential dailies like the Sentinel, the city council finally appointed a woman to the school board in 1896. The Alliance representative received a token position that was popularly regarded by ward leaders as a joke. She was placed on an unimportant committee and sequestered from the board yet reportedly impressed some with her zeal and attention to detail. In the Nineties this appointment was simply a recognition of the increased visibility of the new woman. The first woman on the Milwaukee school board did little to alter established educational policy, but the appointment marked the beginnings of a long tradition of female representation in the local school administration.[82]

Even this small accomplishment by the Alliance occurred over the objections of many small and large businessmen, manufacturers, and professionals on the school board as well as many Germans who opposed the suffrage movement and women's rights generally. When the Alliance first pushed for women on the school board, the Sentinel announced that "the trouble is that the Germans are against it solid, not only those with the full German traditions, but those born here in America. They think women are only good to perform household duties and you can't make them believe anything else."[83] To them housekeeping should be restricted to the private home.

One German ward leader argued that "we don't want them around when we are carrying on business. It is a thing for men to do... It is crowding out the men to let the women in."[84] Some men lost their prejudices against women as school officers over the years and came to respect them as equals. But among the many powerful German dailies in the Nineties only the independent Freidenker ignored ethnic opposition and fully supported women for the school board, emphasizing their purifying influence and domestic and child-rearing talents.[85] Throughout these years the Alliance's chief accomplishment was stirring up discontent and serving as a fountain of new ideas that challenged the legitimacy of the existing educational system. Their ideas were novel and therefore somewhat refreshing if not always accepted by the status quo.

If mothers and women in Kansas City and Milwaukee faced walls of opposition in their respective cities, the same was true for reformers in Toledo and Rochester. In both cities the ward-based school boards were popularly elected and women by mid-decade had the right to vote. Unfortunately, school superintendents in both cities followed the lead of the school board and opposed the innovations and soft pedagogical ideas of the female agitators. Toledo's women faced harassment at the polls, the usual ridicule of German ward leaders, and more heat than they could sometimes stand. Rochester's school officials even conducted a smear campaign against women like Susan B. Anthony and Helen Montgomery and their friends in the Women's Educational and Industrial Union.

In an uncommon display of solidarity between labor and middle and upper class women, the women's branch of the Knights of Labor, the Women's Suffrage Association, and Women's Christian Temperance Union appeared before the Toledo School Board in 1892 and requested its endorsement of a bill pending in the state capitol at Columbus on women's school suffrage. The board deliberated briefly, then openly refused. At the time members of the American Protective Association, an aggressively anti-Catholic organization in the Mid-West and in other parts of the country, had considerable influence on the school board. If not members of the secret organization themselves, the leading elite members on the board sympathized with nativist views. The President of the school board, for example, was Guy Major, a Republican and an extremely wealthy linseed oil manufacturer who publicly denounced Catholics. Major and his cohorts disliked the proposed suffrage legislation since it would enfranchise thousands of Polish Catholic women who wanted to pass legislation to divide the school fund. Major in particular hated Mary Law, a Roman Catholic club woman who was highly tauted by her peers for the school board.[86]

The board's refusal to endorse women's suffrage naturally infuriated many local reformers. Along with other state suffrage organizations, women's groups continued to lobby for a suffrage bill until they finally succeeded in 1894. For the next few years Toledo club women then endeavored to force the Republican and Democratic parties to nominate some women to the school board. After considerable haggling they finally did so. Getting women elected was another matter entirely; ward heelers heckled and jeered most women who appeared at the polls. While "visions of the coming Utopia flitted about in the fancies of the women" upon learning of the new suffrage bill, the realities of political life quickly demonstrated that they were still in Toledo.[87]

Party lieutenants in several Toledo precincts refused to let women register to vote. Once registered, other women were still not permitted to vote. There were widespread reports of missing ballots and voter fraud on election day. The "new woman" had appeared at the polls in 1895 for all to see, claimed the Blade, but the elections were foregone conclusions. Women were heckled, insulted, and told to leave politics to the men. An increasingly powerful figure in the schools at this point was Thomas Tracy, since Guy Major had left the school board to become Toledo's mayor. Tracy was a wealthy attorney, banker, and Republican. A woman challenged him for his position at one point, but "Tracy's heelers crowded the polling places, spitting tobacco juice, and ridiculing the women as they deposit[ed] their ballots."[88] The closest women ever came to serving on the Toledo school board in the Nineties was in 1898, when Mary Law lost in her electoral bid by fifty votes.

Like the women in Kansas City, Milwaukee, and Toledo, those in Rochester similarly agitated for numerous reforms ranging from the abandonment of corporal punishment to higher pay for teachers to manual training and sewing classes. Rochester's women typically ran some new programs at their own expense, received some municipal funding to implement their ideas, and generally labored in a hostile environment. The superintendent and the school board viewed them as troublemakers and Socialists. One ward leader in 1898 said that offering sewing in the schools was as sensible as teaching "blacksmithing" and "potato digging." It would only encourage other cranks to support lunatic ideas like the construction of swimming schools in the schools for recreational purposes. Dangerous ideas indeed![89]

The Women's Educational and Industrial Union encountered problems with the school board from the beginning. The President of the school board in the early 1890s, Henry Noyes, was an attorney and long-time member who had publicly opposed all fads and frills in education. "The effort to teach everything, however desirable, in the schools must end in miserable failure," he warned in 1890.[90] It was the great misfortune of the Women's Union that precisely when it pressed for educational change Noyes was appointed superintendent. Joseph Mayer Rice, who wrote a series of famous muckraking articles on urban education in The Forum in 1892 and 1893, spurred the women on through some local lectures on reform. When he argued that the American schools "sacrifice everything to the hammering process and take little account of the nature or sympathies of the student," the women viewed it as a call to action.[91] To the contented school board, it only meant trouble.

Throughout the 1890s Superintendent Noyes and the school board basically ridiculed the new education and only permitted the establishment of a few manual training and domestic science programs at public expense. Helen Montgomery and her friends publicized the benefits of the new education in various lectures and community meetings and urged Noyes to expand the kindergartens to all parts of the city. Noyes and his cohorts bent on some issues but never broke into a position of full acceptance. Noyes made the sensible point in 1897 that new was not necessarily better, then refused to accept any criticisms on existing programs or methods of education. The belief that sewing trained "the whole child through brain and eye and hand" was treated by the school board as ludicrous.[92] And when the Women's Union further enjoined the school board to abolish the required state regent's exam, since it was a hazard to the health of teachers and pupils and a "fogy" of the "old system of education," the animosity between the female reformers and the school board only deepened.[93]

"Parents have frequently expected our public schools to extend instruction outside their proper limitations," wrote a special school board committee in Rochester in response to advocates of the new education. The committee then proceeded to attack the Women's Union on every pedagogical point. The silly suggestion to treat children "with sugar coated kindness" by ending corporal punishment was a threat to authority and "a great mistake." Little children, even those of "tender years," should not "do as they please." Similarly, manual training and domestic science instruction belonged in the home, not in the school.[94]

The committee then equated the new education with socialism and state paternalism and reaffirmed their allegiance to the old education.

> Fortunately, the school authorities have not yielded to the socialistic demand that the schools be made a panacea for all ills. But the point we particularly wish to make is that our public schools can not be used to relieve parents of their responsibilities.[95]

Long after the ward system was abolished in many cities, this claim that new programs and progressive ideas robbed parents of their independence and responsibilities to their children would resound in the speeches of those who continued to oppose the new education. Through these debates, citizens previewed some future social conflicts in the schools. The battle lines between the old education and the new were formally drawn in many cities as the Nineties drew to a close.

Advocates of social service reform in the schools often refused to face the thorny issues raised by the spectre of increased state intervention in social welfare. Organized women, like all reformers, assumed that they were motivated by altruism, by the need to correct glaring injustices and to shape public policy in enlightened ways. Everyone searched for that elusive end called the public good. And yet women never adequately answered the charges of those who asked whether the state could expand its power without inevitably reducing the power of the family. Those who were critical of the rise of municipal welfare work in the schools, even if they did not approve of the methods of ward heelers, agreed with them that the state had no moral or legal right to intervene in family relations. Parents, not the state, should provide the food, recreational activities, health and medical care, and other services advocated by grass-roots reformers. Once power began to flow to the state, it was argued, it would be impossible to halt the erosion of parental and individual responsibilities.

Organized women who advocated more intensive state intervention, particularly in the lives of the poor, on the other hand, viewed the situation from their own class and ideological vantage points. State intervention was simply the municipalization of motherhood, a way to balance private and public responsibilities for youth, and it helped the middle and upper classes uplift the entire civilization. A speaker to the National Congress of Mothers at the turn of the century put the matter succinctly. "Your children belong to me, to the neighbors, to everybody else, to every one with whom they come in touch." The poor in particular had to learn that "You can not keep them to yourself...They are only lent to you to care for, to help, until they can stand on their own feet and live their lives independently of you."[96] The state would stand between poor parents and their children, and school welfare programs would provide children with the opportunities to escape from their impoverished environments and live independent lives. The state would not become a new parent, only a temporary provider.

One might have asked such a woman of standing if poor parents had the same jurisdictional rights over her children, but reformers rarely broached that subject publicly. They presumed that the poor stood in a dependent position to those who had reached at least middle class standing. Progressive women, for all their obvious compassion and sympathy for the plight of the poor, for the overworked teachers and women workers, always assumed that they knew what was best for all of the children in their community. In the end, as will soon become evident, liberal women's clubs never became as radical as ward leaders in Rochester and other cities feared, and their paternalism generally outweighed their Socialism. With some notable exceptions, women accepted the legitimacy of the larger social system that would force some people to become dependent on state welfare, just as they had often been earlier dependent on private charity. And yet organized women, because of their refusal to move beyond liberal perscriptions for educational reform, fought strenuously for some social welfare services for youth, sometimes for all children but especially for the poor. Whether or not social justice could be achieved within the existing capitalist framework of society remained the central dilemma of social service innovation and Progressive politics.

Women, however, were not the sole champions of the new education and social service innovation in cities like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City during the Progressive era. Socialists, Populists, Social Gospelers, and labor unions that also contributed to grass-roots Progressivism also shaped the new era of reform. Over the next three decades women interacted with many of these groups on a variety of issues affecting the welfare of urban youth, remaining central to the entire reform process. Urban reform received much of its drive, commitment, and interest in children from those who were content with a public title no higher than municipal housekeeper.

Richard Ely of the University of Wisconsin sensed the trends of the day when he noted women's growing importance in The Coming City in 1902. "Whenever you see any peculiarly excellent work going forward in the twentieth-century city you may be sure that the women have something to do with it," he assured his readers. "They are cold and unmoved when we talk about municipal government as business, but when we bring forward the household ideal they think of the children, and when they are once aroused you may be sure that something is going to happen!"[97] Something clearly happened in the 1890s. Women learned the art of association; later they learned how to gain even more power in shaping school policy. In spite of all the elements that went into the shaping of Progressive school reform, it was nevertheless very much a woman's movement.

Brigands' Brains, Master Souls

A worker who does not vote
Socialist is a blockhead or
a scoundrel.
Wisconsin Vorwarts, 1898

Arbeiter aller Lander
vereingt euch!
Beer Bottlers Lokal-Union,
No. 213, Milwaukee

If the gospel had the small
pox the modern church would
not catch it.
Rev. Silvernail, Rochester,
1894

I

The women's club and parent association movement symbolized important community trends of the 1890s. Often the most prominent grass-roots activists of the Progressive era first attracted serious public attention during these turbulent years. Labelled by some as cranks, faddists, and trouble makers, representatives of emerging voluntary groups soon offered social and educational prescriptions for contemporary political ills. A new generation of political activists, comprised of both men and women ranging from liberal to Socialist, gradually attained greater visibility in local cities. And it is in the personal life histories of individuals like Lizzie Black Kander of Milwaukee and Samuel M. Jones of Toledo that one discovers the human motivations that drove people to espouse reform. Instead of finding the impetus for change within the schools, in the lives of "new middle class" superintendents or other school officials, as some historians have emphasized, the student of Progressive school reform must look beyond the school house door and enter the dynamic world of urban voluntarism. Much of the history of late nineteenth century school reform is found in the innumerable voluntary group meetings, protest rallies, and other conduits into which flowed a new social conscience.[1]

The increasing involvement of women in school reform was therefore only one aspect of the evolution of educational reform and social invention in the late nineteenth century. Like all broadly based movements for change, Progressivism was remarkably diverse, involving more than simply those who aspired to municipal motherhood. Additional groups firmly interested in public policy also formed during this period of progress and poverty. Specific laboring populations like skilled workers, for example, demanded more control over the work place, more respect and dignity for the world's laborers, and tangible improvements in local school systems. Socialists also strenuously searched for avenues of influence, seizing the historical moment as a suitable time to test their leadership potential. In turn, various Social Gospel ministers, numerically weak but oratorically vigorous, strained to reconcile basic Christian ethics with an existing social order that now faced the prospects of class war. These voluntary groups were divided by genuine ideological and political differences; they all had their own assumptions and presuppositions about the social order and their role in it. And, for the next thirty years, these groups played an enormous part in the formulation of educational policy.

Together these various interest groups formed the core of grass-roots reform in places like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City during the Progressive era. Like so many groups in Western nations undergoing advanced capitalistic development, these men and women--workers, Socialists, Populists, Social Gospelers, and urban liberals, among others--faced each other in the political arena and vied for the control of the state and public policy. They not only met face to face in countless school board meetings and public debates, but they also utilized the available means of formal communication to popularize their ideas across the city. Long underutilized as a source in educational history, the newspaper became a prime vehicle for disseminating information to the people, who read the dozens of local competing newspapers in their homes, in restaurants and beer gardens, and during their lunch hour. Voluntary groups who wanted the state to look upon them favorably took their politics seriously. While they continually emphasized their differences with competing groups, they nevertheless cooperated with others when they believed in the efficacy of a particular curricular change or social service reform. When the history of social service reform gradually unfolded, it revealed that the existence of a dialectical tension between opposing social interests greatly contributed to the complex dynamics of urban school reform.

Beyond all the obvious differences in intent, emphasis, and visions for the future, a basic, almost unquestioned assumption united all of these diverse groups: the state and its various institutions, and not the family, would have a more important role in children's education and welfare in the modern world. As in the past, the problem became where to draw the line between public and private responsibilities. In the end, however, the practical outcome of voluntary group activity was to enhance the role of the neighborhood school. The social functions of the schools were extended and expanded. New programs and services appeared in the schools, forever changing their purposes and role in urban areas. With their holding power and general influence augmented, the public schools soon became key social and educational institutions, touching more children's lives in more ways than the founding fathers of mass instruction could have ever imagined.

The multi-faceted nature of grass-roots Progressivism became one of its defining characteristics throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Already in the Nineties, many contemporary social commentators tried to determine the future direction of the numerous voluntary and political associations that struggled for civic recognition and dominance. Prominent newspaper editors, for example, asked whether different community interests would congeal into a cohesive movement for social and educational reconstruction or splinter into so many fine pieces. In this vein the Toledo Blade wondered in 1895 whether dissidents and "faddists" could discover some common basis for political unity, whether groups like "the Prohibitionists, the Populists, the free silver at 16 to 1 advocates, and all others, [could] join in one conglomeration of 'reform.'"[2] Although this Republican editor, heir to a well established booster tradition of yesteryear, believed that each group was too preoccupied with its own narrow ends to cooperate with others, the essential question remained: Could social and educational critics motivated by different aims, and shaped by different cultural backgrounds and life experiences, join together on some common basis in the interests of improving society?

A wide and diverse range of voluntary groups therefore surfaced in the depression decade that all had the potential to shape long range educational policy. At the same time that women demanded expanded housekeeping responsibilities and even political equality, local Populist, Socialist, and working-class movements arose on the left. At the same time, of course, conservative and nativist groups emerged on the right like the American Protective Association, one extreme response to the unsettling problems associated with changing patterns of immigration to American cities. In the largest sense, the period was an age of organization, as contemporaries continually remarked in local newspapers and magazines. Individuals mobilized their forces collectively in response to the changes associated with immigration, urban growth, and the triumph of monopoly capitalism. Just as American industry underwent massive movements of consolidation and centralization through pools, mergers, and monopolies, so too did large numbers of ordinary citizens join together to protect their interests and advance their ideas in the public sector. On the local level in the area of school reform, for example, liberal women faced the challenge of those groups who had moved beyond liberalism and favored the creation of a Socialist society. Whether all of these "faddists" and "cranks" would find some basis for mutual association remained a pressing concern not only in the 1890s but throughout the Progressive era.

Surprisingly, cooperation between liberals and radicals on many (though not all) educational issues soon became a distinctive trait of grass-roots reform. With power dispersed along many lines of activity, a single group could not be successful in many areas of school reform without accommodating to some of the demands of other community interests. In the Nineties there were already glimpses of the social cooperation that would soon characterize local movements for reform. The congenial behavior of liberals and more radical reformers was generally highlighted, for example, when suffrage leaders like Susan B. Anthony actively endorsed labor unionism, when politicized women in Milwaukee in 1888 helped agitate for a workingmen's party, and when, in 1892, the Knights of Labor in Toledo supported the petitions of women's clubs desiring school suffrage.[3] This was a preview of the sort of civic interaction that typified Progressive reform on the urban grass roots. Only when disparate groups sacrificed parts of their own reform programs and participated in broader efforts at social amelioration, only when people drawn from different classes, sexes, and ideologies

120

temporarily coalesced, did voluntary associations overcome their civic isolation to forge a "movement" for municipal reform.

Women's clubs and female-dominated parent organizations, along with the help of many voluntary associations, established many social services like vacation schools, playgrounds, and other innovations and tried to improve home and school relations. Yet over the years activist women increasingly lived in a highly charged political environment that was shaped by more radical forces than local communities had ever seen. Municipal reform ranged beyond the women's movement, which was an integral though single part of local efforts at social amelioration. Women were not unaffected by larger movements for reform. Through a common practice of interaction, some women traveled a familiar path from liberalism to Socialism as the years progressed. This change often occurred through association with more ideologically sophisticated groups as, for example, the Social Democrats of Milwaukee or Christian Socialists like "Golden Rule" Jones of Toledo.[4] And men in turn had to deal with the programs and ideas developed by the many club women in their cities.

If the New Education was partially a testament to the energies of the New Woman, it also drew selectively upon the ideas of more highly politicized and deeply rooted working-class elements. Nascent Populist, Socialist, and working-class agitators in the Nineties, especially when joined by radical ministers, offered more critical assessments than women of the capitalist order and therefore had more daring plans for social improvement. By supporting policies to overcome economic and social injustices, these individuals often moved beyond liberal reform. They more openly condemned the contradictions of a society that could produce paupers and millionaires, gutter snipes with holes in their shoes and children of plenty. More than the liberals, radical reformers more vigorously questioned the hierarchy of wealth and power that controlled American society, and asked whether the state could fundamentally eliminate obvious inequalities and tip the balance scale in favor of the poor.

In all of these cities during the Progressive era, specific trade unions and third party groups became more articulate, more visibly critical of society, and more insistent upon increased state intervention in education and social welfare. For these groups as well as for activist women, the Nineties was a decade of hope, planning, and aspiration, with a full field of endeavor lying open before them. What is striking, of course, is how all of these different voluntary association representatives, drawing upon so many rich and diverse ideas and experiences, turned to the child during these years as an object of reform. Socialists and progressive trade unions in all of these cities, but especially in Milwaukee, became vigorous and outspoken partisans for children's welfare. Religious oriented radicals who hated the effects of capitalism just as vocally, if for different reasons, also joined the rising chorus of reform. "Golden Rule" Jones of Toledo was renowned throughout the country for his activities as mayor, and he was only one of the more famous grass-roots Progressives who became dedicated to reform in the depression of the 1890s. Trade union activists, Socialists, and advocates of the Golden Rule soon left their imprint on the evolution of grass-roots reform.

II

The sheer numerical increase in the wage earning class that resided in these cities by 1900 guaranteed that it would have some role in municipal politics and school reform. Industrial statistics at the turn of the century revealed that there were over 15,000 wage earners in Kansas City and Toledo, 33,000 in Rochester, and 48,000 in Milwaukee.[5] Just as capitalists consolidated their businesses through pools, trusts, and mergers, unions helped some workingmen contribute to the organizational spirit of the times. While sounding somewhat deterministic, one historian has argued that "the organization of labor to resist the depredations of organized capital was the historical imperative of the industrial working class."[6] By organizing themselves for their own protection and advance, the skilled workers who formed trade unions in the nineteenth century--the carpenters, the cigar makers, the beer bottlers, the sheet workers, and other laborers--soon developed social perspectives that invariably shaped their beliefs on the common school.

Unions, of course, represented only a fraction of the entire labor force and constituted a type of labor aristocracy. Still, unions nevertheless enabled one important segment of the wage earning class to struggle for social improvements and school reform.[7] Throughout the early Nineties, local cities became more cognizant of their working-class populations. Organized labor especially attracted attention, since its members sometimes espoused unorthodox ideas like Populism and Socialism during those years. With the growth of a sizeable industrial work force, many individuals wondered whether the class conflicts of European cities would be replicated in this country, threatening political stability and social order. Like so many contemporary newspapers, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle sensed that the depression thoroughly undermined public order, for many workers were "setting class against class" and hence were failing to see that the "relations and interests" of labor and capital were "so co-extensive and mutual."[8]

These fears were not unwarranted. There was already tangible evidence that confrontation rather than compromise could inform labor-capital relations. Besides the thousands of lesser known conflicts, nineteenth century Americans were fully appraised through newspapers and magazines of the violence at Haymarket Square and at the Pullman Strike. And so, with such shocking reminders of the existence of class division, the relationship of workers to radical political ideologies became a major public issue by the early Nineties. The Democrat and Chronicle, for example, remarked in 1894 that even Rochester had a vast "industrial army" and claimed that "in this city Anarchists flourish as they do elsewhere." One Anarchist exchanged heated words with a local minister, and the newspaper reported that "the man was of the regular Anarchist breed, shaggy whiskers, compressed lips, wizened eyes, retreating forehead, and falling chin, and dressed in poor apparel."[9] Although few of them were Anarchists or so uncomely, 20,000 citizens marched in a Labor Day parade, which only symbolized the emerging self-consciousness of the working classes.

The Toledo Evening Bee similarly followed the progress of May Day and Labor Day celebrations before concluding in 1899 that Toledo was divided into two groups: "mechanics" and the "so-called middle class."[10] It was a reluctant recognition of the economic divisions that eventually might lead to industrial warfare. Milwaukee, whose Socialist working class movement will be examined shortly, already experienced considerable social conflict. In the May Day Riots of 1886 skilled and unskilled workers clashed with the Wisconsin National Guard. Less industrial than other cities, Kansas City also had its share of boycotts, lockouts, and artisan strikes. Surprisingly large and enthusiastic Labor Day parades convinced the Star that the town at the bend of the Missouri River was now "a workingman's city."[11]

A major issue in the 1890s was whether the trade unions and the great mass of unorganized workers could build an alternative to the traditional two party system. Trade union leaders in particular complained that working people lacked political power commensurate with their numbers. Socialist workers went a step further, arguing that the major parties supported the capitalist system and therefore kept workers economically and politically dependent. They pointed out that workers did not control their own working environments or vital governing structures like the school board. Radical trade unionists, however, had to face the unpleasant fact that most trade unions were apolitical; labor leaders opposed direct involvement in municipal politics and mostly desired bread and butter reforms within the existing economic system. And since the unions were notable failures whenever they did try to enter politics, the Central Labor Union of Rochester and Toledo and the Industrial Council of Kansas City typically refused to affiliate with any political party as a matter of official policy. Only in Milwaukee, where the Union Labor Party almost captured the city in 1888, did workers' sufficiently organize politically and seriously challenge two-party dominance.[12]

When local trade unions organized workingmen's parties after the Civil War, they were repeatedly thrashed at the polls. Their "apolitical" character in later decades resulted from their continual rejection by the voters. Rochester's unions dismissed the usual campaign promises of the major parties in 1861, opting instead for their own "workingmen's ticket" that was crushed on election day. Not surprisingly, thereafter the unions usually refused to endorse the Republicans or Democrats or to organize a new third party of workers.[13] Hopelessness and resignation also weakened the political will of Toledo's unions when the electorate defeated a full slate of candidates of the Workingmen's Party in 1867. Citizens in a free market society that glorified individualism and property rights treated labor unions and their political parties with open hostility and opposition. When Toledo dock workers and other laborers struck for higher wages around the time of the Civil War, the Republican Blade labelled them as "roughs and loafers" and the Democratic Commercial dismissed them as drunkards.[14] In this environment, the Central Labor Union quite logically shunned all political associations after assembling in 1880, for its trade union affiliates failed to see how the so-called labor vote could change the complexion of local politics.[15]

Prior to the 1890s, therefore, trade unionism was never a powerful political force in these cities except for Milwaukee. Yet unions were not paralyzed by their past, only chastened by it. In the Nineties organized labor became conspicuous, loquacious, and occasionally daring. It attacked the conditions leading to the depression and the major parties for failing to eliminate the immediate problems of hunger, inadequate housing, overcrowded schools, and unemployment. Increasingly many trade unions posed the question raised by a Kansas City worker in 1893: "When will working people and producers learn that republican and democratic politicians are both tarred with the same stick? They worship only Mammon and care for labor only on the eve of an election."[16] Urban radicals repeatedly declared that a vote for the established parties was a vote for the status quo. Neither Republicans nor

Democrats offered alternatives to the emerging corporate order, and their perpetuation only sealed the doom of the wage earners. What was needed, it was argued, was a rising working-class consciousness to transform urban politics.

Beginning in the early Nineties, representatives of organized labor developed critical political perspectives that ultimately reevaluated the legitimacy of every public institution. In 1892 the Secretary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners accused Rochester's business elite of ignoring Christian ethics and human rights through their callous exploitation of labor. "No country offers the advantages to tricksters to amass fortunes while they oppress the poor that this country does," claimed this popular speaker to various labor groups. "Great capitalists who go to church to-day, and sit in cushioned pews while they listen" to the teachings of the Golden Rule, "and say amen to it, will tomorrow cut down the wages of their employees ten per cent."[17] Other Rochester workers simply called local capitalists their "natural oppressors and robbers," an easy position to take with roughly one-third of the work force unemployed during the depression.[18] As one radical agitator asserted in an address to laborers, the millions of unemployed should unite against the capitalist class, since workers "will never hear the ring of a dollar which has not been wrung from the sweat of [their] brow."[19]

Even organizations like Rochester's Central Labor Union, which resisted formal alliances with the Socialist Party and affiliated with the non-radical American Federation of Labor, proudly argued as a result of this pro-labor agitation that "all wealth is the result of labor...The working class, is, therefore, the only socially necessary class in the world. Wherever a non-producing class exists it must live parasitically upon the fruits of the toil of the producing class."[20] During the early Nineties the Central Labor Union of Toledo also overcame its usual political reticence and condemned the board of education for employing non-union labor in schoolhouse construction and attacked the major parties for their usual habit of not nominating a working man for the city council.[21] As one worker and Populist warned, "the giant

126

Labor will not always sleep, and he is already stirring from his lethargy and girding on his armour for a fight at the ballot box."[22]

In Toledo, Rochester, and other cities, labor groups greeted national trade union heroes like Eugene Debs with open arms when they addressed the citizenry, much to the chagrin of Democratic and Republican oriented newspapers. Along with Mayor Hazen Pingree of Detroit (a hero of the poor) and Governor John Peter Altgeld of Illinois (who pardoned the Haymarket anarchists), Debs was one of the most popular political figures in labor history, even after he converted to Socialism during his stay in prison during the Pullman strike in 1894. His visions of a Cooperative Commonwealth were ridiculed by defenders of the established capitalist order but offered hope to the millions of workers who knew poverty as their only standard of living.[23]

"The citizen of the ten thousandth century," wrote the working-class Mail of Kansas City in 1892, "will probably look back to the present period as a most barbarous one, in which men were guided in their business and social intercourse by the most heartless principles. The theory of the survival of the fittest nowadays covers a multitude of sins."[24] The abysmal poverty suffered by some and the high rates of unemployment directly impinged on the welfare of the various strata of the working class, who were the most vulnerable to economic dislocation. The spectre of class war loomed large in every city, and newspaper editors reluctantly documented the angry tone of public speeches at labor rallies, celebrations, and parades.

Typical was the description of a labor rally of 1,500 workers in the depths of the depression by the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. Following a mass meeting, these workers marched through the city to the beat of fife and drum, holding placards which read "Wealth for the Few, Slavery for the Many" and "Vote down the Humbugs." One poetically-inclined worker penned a ditty with references to the idle rich: "The idler gets the oyster, the worker gets the shell; the idler goes to heaven, the worker goes to hell. Do you vote for shells?"[25] Conservatives tried to educate workers on the benefits of American citizenship, the errors of mass activism and Socialism, and the high wages received compared to laborers abroad. During hard times much of the rhetoric fell upon unsympathetic ears.[26]

The labor press in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City appealed for social justice rather than charity as the depression took its toll on human comforts and basic human needs. While reform-minded women increasingly tried to solve some important problems in the schools--the dilemma of undernourished and ill-clad children, dogmatic teaching methods, and overcrowded classrooms--Progressive workers were more concerned with eliminating the causes of these and similar social defects; they wanted to eliminate the causes rather than merely the results of poverty and undemocratic government. As early as the 1890s, therefore, the various elements of grass-roots Progressivism demonstrated their own distinctive attitudes toward social amelioration and public policy. More so than organized women, working-class associations urged citizens to move beyond liberalism.

Rochester Labor, for example, asked not for reforms per se but a basic recognition of the rights of labor, equal opportunity, and collective ownership of the means of production. The editor of Kansas City Labor endorsed the Socialist Labor Party in 1895 and claimed that "liberty is the theme--the lack of it the occasion. The dream of [the] earth's oppressed millions is yet to be realized: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,"[27] The Midland Mechanic likewise asserted that if workers searched throughout history, they "will find no age when the robbery of [the] earnings of the masses has been more systematic, more shameless...than today. There was never a time when the worship of great riches, however badly acquired, was more open than today."[28] Everywhere a glaring contradiction surfaced: "labor produces all wealth and provides the luxeries of the rich; but it clothes itself in rags, lives in hovels, is denied justice and ridiculed by plutocracy."[29]

As working-class anger deepened, trade union criticism of the two party system that claimed to represent all citizens but seemed more responsive to "plutocracy" accelerated. This nurtured alternative ideologies that found expression in new third parties.

Becoming outwardly political was a difficult undertaking for workers in many cities. Many urban radicals realized that the Republicans and Democrats, while tied to the prevailing economic order, had political legitimacy. Union members struggled against the apolitical character of their own organizations and tried to convince workers in general to abandon the major parties. Socialist workers in Rochester, for example, addressed thousands of laborers in open air meetings, pointing out the similarities of capitalist Republicans and capitalist Democrats. Agitators asked if it mattered whether workers were crucified on a cross made of gold or silver, in reference to William Jennings Bryan's famous speech during the presidential campaign at the peak of the depression.[30] William Lippelt, a radical trade unionist, implored other workers in 1899 "to abandon the two old capitalist parties and ally with the Socialistic-Labor crusade in the interests of justice and humanity."[31]

The Populist Party in Toledo similarly urged laborers to reject the major parties at the ballot box in 1894. The editor of its newspaper, The People's Call, was like many labor activists enamored by Marx's writings, and he asserted that "some of us have carried torches for one party and some for the other. In this way the wage slaves have played into the hands of their masters and nullified their voting strength."[32] But the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, still not formally Socialist but certainly leaning in that direction, utilized this environment of social protest most effectively. Of all of the laboring groups in these cities, the Trades Council became the most highly politicized and ultimately the most successful third party power in municipal affairs. It was the most consistent and organized working-class force against capitalism in all of these cities.

The Milwaukee labor experience was admittedly somewhat atypical for American cities since, as one historian has written, "the alliance of labor and Socialism in the outstanding fact in the history of unionism in Milwaukee. Though Socialism achieved notable success in other cities, nowhere was its relationship with labor as strong and enduring as in Milwaukee."[33] Tracing how the

Milwaukee Socialists organized labor into a third party force reveals some of the special attributes needed for the successful entry of working people into politics. Other cities, as we have seen, had the potential for similar trade union and Socialist agitation; the Milwaukee trade unions realized this potential. Workers in other cities had their own dynamic qualities, but Milwaukee's socialist working class appeared on the political stage with a special air of bravado and sense of destiny, full of new ideas for educational and social reconstruction. Their history highlights not only the contributions which specific working people made to school reform and social criticism, but also underscores the dynamic character of grass-roots Progressivism in one particular municipal environment.

III

"Crop failures or industrial disturbances may at any moment launch upon us an army of the unemployed and unfed," warned a frightened contributor to the Nation in 1899, who added that under these circumstances "the red flag lurks just around the corner."[34] For it was during the long years of the depression that Populism and Socialism offered urban Americans alternative mass ideologies that competed for the affections of unemployed wage earners, troubled ministers, and other citizens whose consciences were pricked by the suffering in their midst. During the Nineties Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City all had their own Populist and Socialist parties. They struggled with different degrees of success against the established press and even local policemen who sometimes disrupted radical meetings.[35] More importantly, third party dissidents fought against the weight of historical tradition, their largest obstacle, since it supported the legitimacy and viability of the two party system. In addition to the activism of the New Woman and outspoken working-class leaders, therefore, left-wing political parties that would also sanction more state intervention in children's welfare now formed, greatly contributing to the cause of grass-roots reform.

Milwaukee's beer bottlers, Local No. 213, reflected the spirit of the times when it endorsed Marx's plea: "Workingmen of the world unite, all you have to lose are your chains."[36] Fashioning the tools for this job was difficult, even for skilled artisans. How could working people drawn from different ethno-cultural and religious backgrounds form a solid phalanx against their employers? How could artisans and common laborers possibly join hands in a class-based assault on privilege? How, radicals asked, could unions that considered themselves apolitical now coalesce into third parties that would challenge the capitalist system?

One vehicle for reform was the Populist Party, an agrarian organization whose roots extended back to the Greenback struggles in the 1870s. Best remembered historically for its rural heroes like General Weaver of the People's Party and colorful figures like Mary Ellen Lease, Ignatius Donnelly, and "Sockless" Jerry Simpson, Populism flourished in many urban areas in the early Nineties; it was a short-lived though vital third party movement that permitted alienated voters to vent their frustrations against the regular parties. With a largely working-class base, urban Populists grappled with the problems of industrialism, contributed ideas and personnel to evolving Socialist movements, and provided citizens with a forum to articulate and publicize their views on schooling and the capitalist order.[37]

Reporters for the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle in 1894 exposed the difficulties the local Populists encountered in forging a durable political movement. A typical meeting "was made up of the believers in about all the isms held by people outside of the two great parties. There were Socialists, Anarchists, Prohibitionists, members of the Workingmen's Party, Populists, Alliance men, and everything else there."[38] In an effort "to conciliate the different factions," as one Populist admitted, the party platform incorporated a wide range of demands: free textbooks and pencils for children, the municipal ownership of utilities, the enfranchisement of women, and the direct election of Senators, all typical demands of the urban Populists. The Populists publicized these subjects long before the major parties showed any real interest in them. But Populist cranks and dissidents were politically astute yet numerically weak. Far in advance of public opinion, they were certainly no match for the established parties. For example, the Populist Party of Toledo enjoyed few electoral triumphs, and its members were best known for bolting into the meetings of Good Government Clubs, hoping to convert these liberals to radicalism.[39]

Reputable newspapers published many editorials that equated Populism with anarchism, free love, and a leadership of ne'er-do-wells. Because Populist and Socialist parties were so similar in terms of clientele and immediate social demands, editors had difficulties separating one from the other, no matter how much they hated both of them. The Kansas City Star waived the civil rights of radicals, since a man "carrying a red flag...should be arrested" like a drunkard "or dangerous man who is flourishing a deadly weapon."[40] Despite such warnings, Kansas City's radicals remained colorful though politically outnumbered. Drawing upon the workers and small shopkeepers who hated the "trusts" and "special interests," as the enemy was frequently termed, the Populist Party ticket in 1892 received its largest support from the Jackson County Farmer's Alliance in the countryside and a handful of Kansas City's trade unions. Party membership peaked at only several hundred individuals. And then the Populist challenge was further weakened through internal bickering and factionalism. Soon the nativist American Protective Association infiltrated into several Populist cells and began harassing Roman Catholics rather than, as previously, the local plutocrats.[41]

By 1896, the urban Populists of Rochester, Toledo, and Kansas City had been unable to lure significant numbers of voters from the major parties. The Party had provided a home for some dissatisfied citizens, and the Republicans and Democrats would later incorporate some of its programs into their own political platforms. Of course, leaders of the major parties never adopted the ideological cast in which programs had earlier been framed. Yet the initiative, the recall, and the referendum, universal suffrage for both sexes, the income tax, and other innovative ideas first stirred systematically in the minds of the Populists. While Republicans and Democrats spent considerable amounts of time, money, and energy during these years debating the merits of protective tariffs and free trade as cures for an ailing economy, the urban Populists dismissed the notion that these issues fully addressed the problems of an urban and industrial civilization. When the Populist Party fused with the Democratic Party in 1896 and became publicly identified primarily with free silver, it was a repudiation of the complex set of programs and ideas that had energized Populism on the grass-roots level.[42]

Until Branch One of the Social Democratic Party of America was established in 1897, the local Populist Party had been the main voice for Milwaukee's dissident workers and Socialists in the early Nineties. Compared to Rochester, Toledo, and Kansas City, Milwaukee's work force was more ideologically sophisticated and politically influential due to the unique character of its trade union movement. The Federated Trades Council was formed in 1888 and united a wide number of skilled workers from different ethnic backgrounds. Skilled Germans nevertheless formed the driving element in Milwaukee unionism and Socialism. However difficult it was to make the trade unions the economic arm of Socialist political movements in other cities, that task was accomplished during the economic crisis between 1893 and 1897. As a result, Milwaukee would have considerable Socialist and working-class leadership in the schools during much of the Progressive era.[43]

Socialist working-class successes built upon the existing political traditions of this heavily German city and particularly upon the labor and capital struggles that occurred there in the 1880s. As early as 1875, newsboys and working-class dissidents hawked copies of Der Sozialist on street corners along with the trade union papers of groups like the Knights of Labor, an important force in the Eighties. Moreover, Milwaukee experienced May Day Riots in 1886, when a number of workers engaged in massive strikes. Called in to preserve public order, the Wisconsin National Guard aggravated local problems, and the troops soon faced skilled and unskilled workers who marched through the city streets armed with rocks, sticks, and clubs to defend themselves. The militia fired almost without warning upon one group of workers, killing or wounding several citizens, including a man feeding his chickens and a young lad dragging his feet to school. Angered by the imprisonment of strike leaders and the antagonistic nature of the two major parties in the incident, dissidents formed the Union Labor Party in 1888, narrowing missing in its bid to control the city.[44]

One outstanding fact sealed the fate of the Union Labor Party: Socialists voted for their own competing ticket, weakening the labor vote just enough to enable the Citizens' Ticket, a fusion of Republicans and Democrats, to squeeze into office. Not only did this fusion effort convince many workers that there was no essential difference between the Republicans and Democrats, it especially alienated the laborers from the Socialists, whose few votes had prevented the workers' party from defeating the dominant parties. Between 1883 and 1897, political leaders like Victor Berger, a school teacher-turned-Socialist propagandist, tried to mend their differences with the trade unions while affirming the need for a third party of workers. When the depression threw nearly 40 percent of Milwaukee's laborers out of work, the conditions were ripe for change and were actively seized upon by astute political strategists.[45]

The several thousand members of the Federated Trades Council, a growing hotbed of Socialist ideas, summed up the new feeling of the trade unions in 1894 with its poem, "There Must Be something Wrong." It reflected the influence of the depression on its reform spirit and highlighted the contradiction of American progress and poverty.

When earth produces free and fair;
   The golden wavy corn;
When fragrant fruits perfume the air;
   And Fleecy flocks are shorn;
Whilst thousands move with aching head;
   And sing the ceaseless song;
"We starve, we die, oh give us bread!"
   There must be something wrong.[46]

"No Bread, No Work!" was the common refrain in the streets, claimed one disillusioned Comrade.[47] "The bosses buy or build costly mansions, while they rob their workingmen and pay them starvation wages," wrote another champion of the unemployed.[48]

One satirical advertisement in the Artisan Day Souvenir published by the Federated Trades Council in 1894 said it all:

> WANTED
>
> An unlimited number of male human beings, called 'men' by the superficial, who are willing to march through mud, sleet, and snow, and break one another's head. Must be poor and have mortgaged homes and farm. Unemployed also desired...No person who uses brains for the purpose of thinking will be admitted. Brains were made for the use of brigands and cut-throats only. Upon the acceptance of applicants they will be divided into two hositile camps and labelled 'democrat' and 'republican,' and while their wives bend over the wash tub, and their babies cry for bread, they will be fighting one another, when they are not searching for work, or when not engaged in picking the scrap from slop barrels.[49]

All interested applicants for these positions were urged to contact the "Demo-Repo Executive Committee, Wall St., New York."

If brains were for brigands, the Milwaukee trade unions and the Socialists exemplified organized brigandage. Under the dynamic leadership of Victor Berger, a German-born dissident who edited the Socialist Wisconsin Vorwarts after 1893, the trade unions and the Socialists resolved their differences, laying the basis for their growing influence in civic life after the turn of the century. After the separate failures of the Union Labor Party and the Socialist Party in 1888, Socialist and trade union groups slowly aligned in third party efforts. In 1893 the Federated Trades Council, the Populist Party, and the Socialists endorsed the "Cooperative Ticket," which was a Populist workingmen's party that endorsed democratic political devices like the initiative, referendum, and recall, free textbooks for children, the municipal ownership of utilities, the abolition of the contract labor system, and the eight hour day. Electoral successes were few, but workers sharpened their own political consciousness, finely honing their intellect as they conceived of a society controlled not by the major political interests but what they termed a party of proletarians.[50]

As the editor of the German-language Vorwarts, Victor Berger applauded the progress of the Populist Party. An active Party member, Berger continually urged it to move further to the left, believing that "the People's Party contains the basic elements of an Anglo-American Socialist Party."[51] Through their active political support of the Populist Party for several years, the Socialists demonstrated that they could be trusted and would not abandon the workers as they did in 1888. However, Berger and his associates simultaneously tried to popularize and legitimate Socialist ideas in Milwaukee. They met in the Nineties in a Sozial-Demokratischer Verein, in various Turner athletic groups, and in the Mannerchor, a popular singing organization with many working-class members.[52]

By 1896 the Vorwarts demanded that the Populists endorse a "more doctrinaire" program for "progressive political action," namely, a statement on the goal of establishing a Socialist state.[53] When they refused, Berger vigorously attacked the Party, which expelled him for his uncompromising stand. Berger's actions were largely based on his realization that the Federated Trades Council was finally ready to support Socialism. By 1897 the Socialists had their own party, many former Populist members, and the endorsement of the Trades Council. In a somewhat premature obituary, Berger soon announced that "the Populist Party is dead, it lives in Socialism."[54]

From the turn of the century to the 1940s the Social Democratic Party was the political arm of the Federated Trades Council and the embodiment of grass-roots Progressivism in Milwaukee. Events later showed that the Socialists could reach out beyond their German, skilled labor base, cooperate with women's organizations in many school service reforms, and still offer fresh and biting commentary on school and society. Largely a third party force during its lifetime, the Social Democratic Party provided considerable leadership in the schools and in municipal politics generally. Populism did survive in Socialist thinking, as Berger had noted, exemplified when the Social Democratic Party adopted many of its programs. But the S.D.P. added some of their own and integrated them all into a tight ideological framework.[55]

The Milwaukee Socialists and the Federated Trades Council were unique among Populist and trade union movements in the sense that they participated in immediate working-class demands for new social programs but never lost sight of their more radical ends. Like the Social Democrats, many labor groups helped form the vanguard of educational reform in the Progressive era, endorsing school service reforms like free lunches, social centers, playgrounds, medical and dental inspection, and other innovations. The majority of non-Socialist trade union groups often saw these reforms as ends in themselves. Compared to the Milwaukee Socialists, these associations were less powerful, less aggressive, less successful politically, less willing to entertain explicitly non-capitalist ideologies. In most cities after the turn of the century, when the majority of Progressive reforms in education were implemented, radicals were on the fringe of local organized labor movements; in Milwaukee they occupied its center.[56]

When the Social Democrats and the Milwaukee trade unions formulated their ideas on school and society after the depression, they did so in a self-consciously radical framework. They quoted Marx's political maxims freely, sometimes with reckless abandon, but they continually tried to adapt his ideas to an American environment. They would not have any direct power over school reforms until 1909, when they elected their first official representatives to the school board. Like women's organizations, they were still developing their ideas and trying to prove their worth to themselves and to the community at large throughout the Nineties.

By the turn of the century, however, the Socialists were widely identified with a number of social and political demands. In the area of schooling, for example, they fought for some of the Populists' favorite reforms: the use of the schools as community centers, the distribution of free textbooks to children, and public lectures for adults. The Socialists and the Federated Trades Council in 1900 unanimously adopted the following resolution on education, steeped in the language of class struggle:

> Bear in mind that of all things feared by the expropriating class is Knowledge when possessed by the wage-slave. Knowledge is power.[57]

The local Socialists took a broad perspective on social issues and saw the radical efforts as "the American expression of the international movement of modern wage earners for better food, better houses, sufficient sleep, more leisure, more education, and more culture."[58] The Socialists continually evolved in terms of the types of programs they endorsed, from the direct election of the Milwaukee school board to the call for the abolition of the United States Senate! One could never accuse them of being political mossbacks.

It is important to differentiate the various elements of grass-roots Progressivism as they organized in the Nineties. Each reform group--from the Populists to the Socialists to the women's clubs--had an element of historical autonomy and individuality that should be appreciated and remembered. At the same time, of course, no group was an island unto itself, unaffected by the actions of others or sequestered socially from the dominant forces of the age. Comparisons between the Milwaukee Socialists and the average women's organization illuminate this point. Although groups like the Woman's School Alliance and the Social Democratic Party formed during the depression, the W.S.A. leadership and membership never shared the long range perspective of, say, Victor Berger, who in 1895 predicted in the Vorwarts that Milwaukeeans would be living in a Socialist state within fifty years.[59] Women's organizations did not commonly discuss the need for the redistribution of wealth and income or for working-class control over the means of production. They rarely even discussed Marx's ideas on proletarian revolt and certainly never considered themselves Socialists. That does not mean that the women were unmoved by the spectacle of poverty or of undernourished and ill-clad street waifs and gutter snipes, for they had a notable social conscience at a time when many Americans adhered to crude Darwinian theories of social survival.

The differences between organized liberals and organized radicals did not lay so much in the immediate social programs they endorsed but in their long range views. Where women often saw reforms as ends in themselves, Socialists saw them as means to larger political revolution and social transformation. Very few women functioned out of the intellectual framework that shaped the Federated Trades Council. The Council routinely argued in 1900 that "when wealth producers live in poverty and idlers roll in luxery, it is very evident that the industrial system which permits such conditions must be wrong, and requires a change," and it also affirmed that "as the power of capital combines and increases, the political freedom of the masses becomes more and more a delusion."[60] For all their genuine sympathies for the poor and for the children of workers, liberal women never described their associations as the Social Democracy viewed itself--"a proletarian organization in opposition to capitalism."[61] Liberals shared a deep concern with the immediate programs desired by working-class and Socialist groups. They also lacked a full-fledged commitment to larger radical ends.

It is of course unreasonable to expect that these more comfortable women would have shared the ideological perspectives of factory workers, for these groups had enormously different personal life histories and experiences. Yet the differences between groups that often cooperated in municipal reform must be appreciated and respected. A number of different motivations, personalities, perceptions, and interests converged in the making of grass-roots Progressivism. Reformers came to support social invention and state intervention for different reasons. To women the schools were often perceived as an outlet for their domestic talents, a place where their maternal abilities could bring about desirable changes. Even though they would later often ally themselves with Socialist workers for particular school innovations, women viewed the schools in their own unique terms. Socialists, on the other hand, saw their involvement in the schools as one more battle against capitalism and its supporting social institutions. Socialist parties, it was argued, must fight to control the schools and run them in the interests of the wage earners. Grass-roots Progressivism, therefore, had its middle class and feminine as well as working-class and Socialist roots, growing together in the Nineties like entangling vines that crossed but did not always join. The rise of the Social Gospel and progressive religion added the final stimulus to the growth of municipal reform.

IV

"Nearly all forms of charity and human betterment began in the souls of men and women who had the substance of religion in them," wrote Rochester's famous Social Gospeler, Walter Rauschenbusch, in 1914. "Their impulses of mercy or anger may have been uninstructed, but at least they saw and struck before science or government moved ...All things being equal, a man of religious faith and temper is always wiser and stronger. The religious souls are the master souls."[62] Throughout the depression new religious and moral impulses inspired grass-roots Progressivism. Joining women, workers, and Socialists in the protests of the Nineties was a number of individuals who tried to square the realities of urban and industrial life with Christianity and especially the ethics of Jesus Christ.

Whether religious ideals helped resolve the problems of progress and poverty was frequently debated by women's clubs, labor unions, and Socialist parties during these turbulent years. That only added to the complex nature of the origins of Progressive school reform. Interested citizens wondered if the ancient maxims of the Golden Rule and the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount had any importance in the modern world. Though the Social Gospel and Progressive religion appeared in Rochester, Milwaukee, and Kansas City, it nevertheless was most visible during the mayoralty of Toledo's Samuel M. Jones (1897-1904). Just as Milwaukee politics highlighted the centrality of Socialism and working class agitation in municipal reform, Toledo exemplified the religious sentiments that contributed so much to the origins of Progressivism. Nicknamed the Golden Rule mayor, Jones became Toledo's most important educational reformer before the turn of the century.

American Protestantism had reached a crisis stage in the late nineteenth century, and Jones' rise to power and national fame occurred within that context. The social classes produced by industrial capitalism fragmented the attitudes of urban citizens toward their religious institutions. Workingmen abandoned the Protestant churches by the thousands in the Gilded Age yet retained a fervent faith in fundamental Christian ethics which they believed were ignored by the modern church. As Henry F. May and other historians have well documented, Protestant churches overwhelmingly stood on the side of capital and order in labor disputes and in the process alienated large numbers of working people. Ministers routinely inveighed against labor unions, Socialism, Anarchism, and radical calls for the redistribution of wealth and power in the market place.[63]

Arthur M. Schlesinger long ago noted that the Gilded Age Protestant church had become "an institution where ill-clad worshippers were unwelcome and where the Nazarene himself would have been snubbed."[64] By the Nineties many workers who abandoned the two party system as well as the church found solace and solidarity through their involvement in unions and third party movements. Working-class critics continually attacked the selling of church pews, the alleged capitalist domination of formal religion, and the failure of Protestant churches to base their institutions on fundamental Christian values like brotherhood, justice, and a regard for the welfare of the poor.

At a meeting in Rochester in 1893 several hundred workers hooted "jeers and sneers" against the church when one agitator reported that ministers refused to open their institutions as lodging houses. "It was very evident that the majority of those present had no friendly feeling for churches or ministers," contended one participant.[65] But that did not mean that working people were irreligious. "We believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," asserted Rochester's leading Populist, who went on to attack those "good people who pray for the laboring man one day in the week and prey off them six days." The time must end when one class enjoyed "themselves at the Lord's table and fill[ed] themselves with wine and bread while the other class is compelled to do the fasting."[66]

In city after city, working men and others educated ministers and priests on Christian ethics and the anti-Christian ways of the modern church. Toledo's Central Labor Union in 1893 patiently listened to the Populist gubernatorial candidate. He was given a hearty round of applause when he called for an end to nativism, business monopoly, and religious prejudices that divided Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish workers. This Populist then attacked the churches for their failure to champion the side of labor and the teachings of Jesus. "The gospel of Jesus dealt more with the labor problem than with soul saving," he claimed.

> The Master, himself a carpenter, had formed a labor organization, which acted for the benefit of soul and body. The twelve not only studied economics, but struck the labor problem, and the Master saw that the only way to deal with the money changing robbers was to drive them out. Then the bosses of the dominant political party set their heelers to work at the beck of the bankers, and three days after they crucified the Savior.[67]

Writers repeatedly emphasized Jesus' working-class roots, his obvious support for labor unions, and his life among the common people. His life sharply contrasted with the institutions founded in his name.

The members of the Federated Trades Council in Milwaukee, whose Socialistic tendencies caused Catholic priests to attack them as atheists, struck the common blow against the established churches. If the churches, like Jesus, believed in brotherhood, why did they attack strikers and print their sermons on non-union presses? "While urging upon their faithful followers the practice of sympathy and charity for their fellow men, they conduct their business altogether on the mercenary and skin-flint principle."[68] The working-class Kansas City Mail asserted that since the church "has forgotten the simplicity and love of Jesus, its founder," the "church proper has almost lost its hold upon the working people and the vast undercrust of society which has no visible means of earning a living."[69] A contributor to the Midland Mechanic later in the decade argued that Jesus was murdered for his sympathies for the poor, a point ignored by most ministers, and he further contended that "any branch of the church that is not in the van of progressive reform movement has outlived its usefulness."[70]

The bombastic assertiveness of leading trade union leaders and third party advocates was an unprecedented challenge to the authority of Protestant ministers in local communities. Religious statistics for 1890 indicate that less than half of the people of Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City were communicants in the various church sects, and the outspoken criticisms now lodged against them demanded thoughtful responses. The percentage of communicants of the entire population ranged from a low in Kansas City (24 percent) to higher figures for Milwaukee (33 percent), Toledo (40 percent), and Rochester (44 percent).[71] Moreover, in the latter three cities, Catholics, who emphasized church attendance more than Protestants, formed over half of the communicants listed in the Census. While these were still overwhelmingly Protestant cities, new Catholic immigrant Poles and Italians in particular added to their religious diversity. The established institutions therefore faced challenges from new immigrant populations as well as angry Protestant workers, setting the stage for the Social Gospel.

Advocates of the Social Gospel in local cities tried to overcome a generation of hostility between workers and the Protestant churches in the 1890s. In Rochester, for example, Blake McKelvey has demonstrated that prior to the Nineties "workingmen were more frequently admonished than defended" from the pulpit.[72] Ministers in the early 1890s viewed labor unions as anarchistic led and Devil inspired, and workers were often called drunkards. "The men who cry the hardest against capital are those who are beggared by profligacy," announced one Protestant minister in 1890.[73] In 1894 a local Baptist agreed that workers were alienated from the church, but nevertheless placed the burden on the workers to end their estrangement from God's messengers.[74]

Although a number of scholars have correctly identified the Social Gospel as an essential ingredient in Progressive reform, Herbert G. Gutman first recognized that workers themselves developed the basic tenets of social Christianity.[75] And while the reform impulse for urban Progressivism was indeed a product of new religious views that sympathized with working-class struggle, scholars have overemphasized the power of the Social Gospel within the churches. Social gospelers were a tiny minority within the clergy. The majority of ministers in these cities opposed innovations like the "civic church" and the "institutional church" which were supposed to bridge the gap between religious institutions and the working class. As Rauschenbusch himself aptly recollected in Christianizing the Social Order in 1912, "We were few and we shouted in the wilderness."[76]

There were of course numerous, now forgotten efforts by liberal clergymen to radicalize their peers and help usher in the millenium. After searching through the historical record, however, one must conclude that workers more systematically championed the Social Gospel than the clergy. In all probability the basic Christian values of brotherhood and justice held particular meaning to wage earners during this period of acute social tension, economic disorder, and dissatisfaction with the established political system. Moreover, ministerial advocates of the Social Gospel often had publicity far beyond their numbers. Their outspoken support for labor and even Socialism certainly made better press than the usual Sunday sermon, but liberal and radical ministers who championed the working classes were, like so many other cranks and faddists, marked men.

Every city had a handful of ministers who openly attacked capital and cast their lot with the masses. Rochester had its Rauschenbusch, Toledo had its A. G. Jennings and George Herron; Milwaukee had its sympathetic Methodists and Baptists, and so did Kansas City. Men like Rev. Stephen Northrup of Kansas City tried to recapture the simplicity of early Christianity, building an institutional church in a working-class district "devoid of spires and steeples and the usual marks of a church edifice."[77] Sermons were pitched to the laboring people, halls were opened for union meetings, and sympathetic ministers continually searched for ways to impress citizens with the ethical basis of Jesus' teaching: "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."[78]

The most famous religious figure in these cities was perhaps Samuel M. Jones, a Toledo businessman who held quite conservative views until the depression altered his social conscience. He was not a minister--indeed, he stopped attending church and was repeatedly condemned by the Pastors' Union--but he nevertheless exemplified the religious impulse within grass-roots Progressivism and demonstrated how these values contributed to increased emphasis on social invention in the urban schools. Jones was one of the most popular figures in Toledo's history, a folk hero whose memory lived on for decades after his death in 1904. He was the cutting edge of educational and social reform in Toledo, revered by the working classes as well as by women's groups that applauded his Christian activism. By the turn of the century one of the handful of radical mayors in the urban Midwest, Jones was the secular embodiment of the New Religion and one of the most colorful municipal reformers of his generation.[79]

Jones' early life obscured the qualities that would make him the leading Progressive critic of capitalism in Toledo in the 1890s. His life went from rags to riches. Born in Wales in 1846, Jones settled in New York with his parents as a young child, received a common school education totaling thirty months, and worked in a saw mill. When the opportunity availed itself, this enterprising lad soon found himself employed on a steamboat in the Ohio Valley. Hoping to find his fortune, he then traveled to the boom oil fields of Pennsylvania, instead finding an industry which exploited men with long hours of work for relatively short pay. Jones migrated from town to town in search of work, at one point sneaking out of a boarding house without paying his bill. Though his personal experiences with poverty did not initially cause him to question the legitimacy of the capitalist order, he never forgot "the feeling of utter desolation that possessed me as I walked up the street of the bustling town, with my grip in hand, not knowing how or where I was to pass the night."[80]

Luckily, he landed a mechanic's position in a local boom town, survived by living communally in a tent with several workers, and ultimately abandoned Western Pennsylvania for a position in Lima, Ohio, the site of another oil boom. By this time Jones invented a revolutionary device in the oil industry called a sucker rod, which drew oil from the ground with great efficiency and ease. He moved to Toledo in the early 1890s, where he mass produced his invention at the Acme Sucker Rod Plant. By the middle of the business depression, Jones was transformed from an ordinary manufacturer to one of the leading radical thinkers in the city.[81]

Instead of finding total happiness in Toledo, Jones was shocked when he confronted the basic contradiction of American society: progress and poverty. Jones had not lived a sheltered life. He had seen numerous men begging for work in the oil fields and had himself lived for weeks on little more than bread and beans. None of this, however, prepared him for life in the city. Although his plant was relatively small, Jones received hundreds of pitiful appeals for work as the depression deepened across the city. An unlettered woman made a typical plea:

> having heard so much about you and your kindness to the poor, I come to you... please do not think we are [sic] biggars for we are not but our father above tells me to lay this before you my husband has no work and has had a felon on his thumb for the last eight weeks and you know what that means for a poor man with three children to keep clothing almost gone back in our rent and hardly enough to eat some days now my husband is willing to work and is a good christian but sickness and no work has brought us where we are...[82]

As Jones later recalled, "I think the first real shock to my social conscience came when the swarms of men swooped down upon us...I never had seen anything like it; their piteous appeals and the very pathos of the looks of many of them stirred the deepest sentiments of compassion within me. I felt keenly the degradation and shame of the situation."[83]

Like the Socialist working-class poet of Milwaukee, Jones believed that something was fundamentally wrong. He therefore aggressively searched for explanations to the problems of unemployment and poverty. A regular church attendant, he considered the usual belief that poverty resulted from the intemperance and indolence of the workers themselves, finding it a poor explanation for the plight of the hundreds of men who begged him for a job. He told Henry Demorest Lloyd in 1897 that perhaps ten thousand people were unemployed in Toledo alone. "The rather anomalous spectacle confronts us that, while the streets are full of idle men, our banks are full of idle money."[84] "Poverty," he wrote, "is too widespread a disease to account for it by cataloguing a few individual frailties...To blame the unfortunate creatures themselves, to pharisaically point to their lack of thrift, their large families, and so forth, is to treat a large subject in a trifling way."[85]

During the depression Jones found answers to contemporary social problems in ancient Christian beliefs. He believed that the practice of the Golden Rule and the basic tenets of Jesus' teachings would establish a veritable Heaven on Earth. Soon after his arrival in Toledo, Jones led a study group formed by Toledo's most radical minister, Rev. George D. Herron of the First Congregational Church, who later became one of the nation's leading Christian Socialists and a member of the Socialist Party.[86] Jones turned to the Bible, to Marx, to Tolstoy, to Whitman, and to a host of Social Gospel writers whose essays now appeared in religious and lay periodicals. He invited feminists and radicals to Golden Rule Hall to address the workers and interested citizens. He even visited Chicago's Hull House, and Jane Addams claimed that he was the only person ever to receive a standing ovation from a radical study group that met there in the Nineties.[87] His ideas were simple but were ultimately endorsed by labor unions and women's clubs across his adopted city.

Besides corresponding with reform leaders and Socialists across the country, Jones read and reread the Bible and particularly the Sermon on the Mount, now his greatest source of inspiration. He became convinced that the only solution to injustice was the application of the Golden Rule and brotherhood ideals to everyday experience. He came to agree with trade union leaders, Populists, and Socialists who felt that Christianity as expressed by Jesus' life was poorly represented in the modern church. "It seems to me the Church, instead of getting a few out of the world into a place of safety, needs to do as Jesus did; get himself into the world, in order that it may save all."[88] He repeatedly blamed the churches for their failure to lead modern campaigns for social justice, and announced that "I believe in Equality, my dear brother...I believe that poverty and crime are results of social injustice, and above all things, we ought not to call our civilization a Christian civilization; for when we have a Christian civilization according to Jesus, we shall have the Kingdom of Heaven here upon earth."[89]

Jones first applied his new beliefs at his factory. Social service became his chief concern. Unlike other Toledo manufacturers, he viewed industrial time discipline as dehumanizing and alienating. He therefore replaced the time clock with a tin sign that hung on the wall that read, "Do Unto Others As You Would Have Them Do Unto You." The Golden Rule, this infamous crank argued, was the only rule needed anywhere in society, including the factory. "My belief in Equality," he asserted, "has led us to undertake the experiment of running a shop without 'bosses,' 'rules,' 'discipline.' I believe the way to make people better is to believe in them, to trust them, rather than to 'boss,' 'rule,' 'govern,' or 'force' them."[90]

Jones was very disillusioned with how factory life separated men into employers and workers and how men loved Mammon rather than each other. He repeatedly asserted that factories made profits but "unmade" men by treating them as mere "hands."[91] To undermine class distinctions and industrial abuses, Jones established the city's first industrial health plans for workers, paid vacations, profit sharing, higher pay, and a shorter work week;

and he inaugurated picnics and excursions to the parks for workers and their families. Then this poorly schooled but highly educated man started to write weekly sermonettes to his workers, always emphasizing the iniquities of capitalism and the importance of human brotherhood. Jones set up the Golden Rule Band, Golden Rule Settlement House, and instead of expanding his factory at one point established a free Golden Rule Park and playground for area children. Social service became the dominant note in his life.[92]

It is not surprising that several labor unions applauded Jones' emergence as a Christian businessman, something Jones himself regarded as a contradiction in terms in a capitalist society. The Toledo Union first urged Jones to run for public office. Here was a man who ate his meals with his workers, joined them in their singing society (and entertained them with his violin), believed in the Golden Rule and actually tried to implement it in his factory. Here was a man who would defy the ministers, manufacturers, Chamber of Commerce, the major newspapers, and various institutional voices of respectability and contentedness, and still easily get elected to office. In 1899 he won nearly 70 percent of the vote despite the fact that all of the above groups opposed him and that he ran without the support of either major political party.[93] He became a symbol of third party, working-class, and Socialist-like protest in Toledo in the 1890s, a unique example of the forces that converged in urban grass-roots Progressivism.

Jones' desire for a Kingdom of God on earth was only the most dramatic example of how religious enthusiasms motivated a number of reformers in the depression years of the Nineties. Jones and his Christian brethren told "the tale of a new time,"

> Of a world that surely will be,
> When men live as comrades and lovers,
> All rancor and hate under ban,
> And the highest and holiest title
> Will be that you're known as a man.[94]

Affirming his faith on numerous occasions on the dignity of all men and women, he championed a full program of municipal socialism during his tenure as mayor, and in particular denounced nativist groups, anti-black prejudice, and anti-suffrage organizations.[95] As he told one minister, "I see in every human life a child of God, and as I look upon them, they all appear to me as People, just People, some of them have had opportunity, thousands and millions have never had any."[96]

Christian ethics, therefore, was a salient factor in the evolution of this important Progressive reformer. It was part of the exciting social developments that changed Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City in the 1890s, a contributing force to the social and intellectual milieu that ushered in an age of educational innovation and school reform. The groups that formed in the Nineties--the club women, the Populists, the Socialists, the resurgent labor unions, and the Social Gospelers--provided much of the impetus and leadership found in these cities by the turn of the century. Individuals ranging from ordinary parents in school associations to articulate Socialist publicists like Victor Berger of Milwaukee would interact on many school related issues during the Progressive era, as third party participation in school reform in local cities reached an all time high. The precise way in which outsiders could become insiders was the unsolved riddle at the dawn of the new century.

150

A "Better Class" Of Men

For years the school directors
have all been representative
men, of good business and
social standing.
    Kansas City Times, 1882

The salvation of the country is
in the school children, and no
standard of character and ability
can be too high for membership in
the board of education.
    A Rochester Good Government Leader,
    1897

I

Urban Americans in the late nineteenth century faced numerous reform groups that tried to set the course for social change in school and society. In addition to the nativist programs of the American Protective Association and the radical proposals of the Social Democracy, contemporaries encountered the demands of the "new woman" and the platforms of the urban Populists, the pleas of Good Government leaders and the realities of ward politics. In reaction to capitalist consolidation of business enterprise, which now reached all time highs, trade union leaders, Socialists, and urban radicals endorsed a wide range of new state policies: stronger business regulation, democratic political devices like the iniative, recall, and referenda, and even the collective ownership of the means of production. Numerous panaceas, from Henry George's Single Tax to immigrant restriction legislation, offered hope to many citizens seeking reform or stability at a time of social division. Citizens from all walks of life confronted the prevailing problems of industrial alienation, urban squalor, and unresponsive schools.[1]

By the late nineteenth century, urban citizens realized that social change was an unmistakable feature of everyday life and that school innovations reflected the trend toward large scale social transformation. This was not lost upon newspaper editors, magazine writers, politicians, and ordinary citizens. Urban and industrial lifestyles now challenged rural and agrarian modes of living, changing patterns of immigration swelled the population tide, and struggles between labor unions and business leaders over control of the work place inspired insurgent third party movements. Every social institution was scrutinized and criticized. Just as the two party system in politics, capitalist dominance in the economy, and male control of public governing boards were questioned in some quarters, the existing system of school governance similarly came under attack. Since most school innovations, social service programs, and other aspects of the "new education" were inaugurated at a time of administrative centralization in education, the changing nature of governance became central to the history of all subsequent changes in urban schooling at the dawn of the new century.

In many respects, school board centralization was the first major educational policy issue confronted by various elements of the grass-roots in the early Progressive era. For this reason, the subject of school reorganization--a pressing matter in local cities by the depression years--deserves serious consideration. For changes in the educational governing structure influenced the rate at which certain programs were established, funded, and integrated into the Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City school systems.[2] New programs depended on who controlled the schools, how power was distributed, and whether reformers had influence with those in positions of power or served on school boards themselves. The major social reforms in the schools commonly labelled by many contemporaries as "progressive"--playgrounds, nutritional services, medical and dental inspection, manual training and domestic science programs, free lectures, social centers, district high schools--resulted from the interaction between various grass-roots reformers previously enumerated and school administrations that were increasingly centralized. These innovations, therefore, cannot be understood apart from their relationship to significant administrative changes that occurred by the turn of the century. The establishment of decentralized programs and services in the schools happened at the very time that local representation on school boards declined in favor of city-wide interests.[3]

Historians of urban education in the Progressive era have properly identified school board centralization as a fundamental social change in modern history. Community reformers of the recent past have mightily labored, often unsuccessfully, to eliminate the administrative reforms of the early twentieth century. Students of Progressive educational change generally interpret the "reform" of urban school boards as a major victory of, by, and for the upper socioeconomic class. Primarily representative of the professional and business elite, reformers initiated political change to assault localism and undermine the political influence of lower and middle income groups in the schools. David Tyack, for example, equates the ward system of school governance with "the people," and he concludes that the "administrative progressives" consolidated their power through centralization and enforced their will upon a diverse population. William Bullough similarly asserts that school board centralization reflected an elite trend in urban politics in the early 1900s that led to a massive decline in "popular participation" in the schools. Clarence Karier, citing the pathbreaking scholarship of Samuel P. Hays on the social consequences of school board centralization, concludes that Progressive era reforms effectively removed "the poor and the disinherited" from power.[4]

These interpretations as well as others reject the traditional liberal belief that Progressivism was a mass movement to democratize American life, and their critical assessments have enriched our comprehension of school innovation in an era of rapid social change. What is missing in their analyses, however, is a recognition that women's organizations, labor unions, and Socialist Parties had tangible effects on school programs and curricular change despite the fact that not all of these groups equally endorsed or profited from school board centralization. Moreover, although the ward system of representation on city school boards has been depicted as a superior model of school governance compared with Progressive era boards of education, it is an exaggeration to equate the former with "the people" and with "the poor and disinherited."

Like their successors, ward leaders could be illiberal, insular, petty, vindictive, and parochial, as well as fair, thoughtful, and responsive to the public will and local neighborhoods. The ward system provided avenues of social mobility and respectability for ethnic leaders as well as nativist bigots like Guy Major of Toledo, the local champion of the American Protective Association. Centralized school boards similarly counted among their numbers narrow minded efficiency experts as well as outstanding Socialist women like Meta Berger, who defended working class interests on the Milwaukee school board for three decades. Women of different political persuasions made strides under the centralized structure that were unknown under the ward system. Fewer cosmopolitan elites served on school boards in these cities under the ward system than was true of Progressive era boards, but the pre-1890s were not necessarily the golden age of urban school systems.[5]

Whether or not one accepts all of the recent historical generalizations on urban school reform--which has contrasted the democratic localism of ward-based school boards with the elitism of their successors--the research of Hays and Tyack in particular has deflated the liberal notion that centralization necessarily produced progress and justice in American schools. On the contrary, elites who engineered the removal of neighborhood control in the schools and emulated the corporate structures of business enterprise in revamping educational governing boards had little sympathy with localism and direct neighborhood influence on policy. In trying to make the schools more business-like and efficient, these champions of "non-partisanship" denied their own political ambitions and disdain for less powerful interest groups but, more important, pretended that educational policy could somehow rise above politics. Indeed, they acted as if state and public policy represented public interest and not their own peculiar needs. In so doing, these admirers of business monopolies and centralized governing structures actually tried to seal off political dissent from the public arena and denied the salient position that political activity attained in late nineteenth-century America.

To argue that school related issues could become "non-partisan" therefore not only masked the political designs of increasingly powerful civic leaders in local communities but also served as an ideological defense for anti-democratic behavior. For the school centralizers were not disinterested reformers; instead, they openly admired and were often themselves members of an emerging corporate-oriented elite. They realized that a highly politicized electorate could counter their growing power. Voting turnout had already reached its historical apex in this country, and the various groups who emerged in the depression Nineties were hardly apolitical but keenly interested in shaping state policy. One historian, besides noting the remarkably high voter turnout during the period, has remarked that electioneering, politicking, and political enthusiasm generally was an ever present social phenonemon. Whether or not they waved the bloody shirt, contemporary Americans took their politics seriously: "Handkerchiefs, playing cards, mugs, posters, buttons emblazoned with candidates' names and party symbols poured forth in an unending stream."[6] And, with the rise of radical groups like the Socialists in the 1890s, business reformers quite naturally devised strategies to neutralize and hopefully eliminate contending political interests. They continually called for "non-partisan" solutions to highly partisan problems and argued that their ideas contributed to the so-called higher interests of the school and the larger community.

The national trend toward school consolidation at the turn of the century was clearly reflected in political developments in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee. In 1900 Rochester's elective, ward-based board was replaced with a five member board elected at large. Toledo's ward based board similarly fell from power in 1898. A year earlier, Milwaukee's unusually large, council-appointed ward board was reduced to a twenty-one member board; it was still ward-based but now it was appointed by a special four-man commission chosen by the mayor. Unlike these three cities, Kansas City already had a small, city-wide elected school board since the 1870s, and its schools enjoyed a continuity of board structure and elite leadership unknown in most American cities. But these movements for school board reorganization in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee were characteristic structural changes of the period, and they were full of import for the many future innovations in the schools. By the turn of the century, power relationships took shape that would continue to affect all aspects of local educational policy for many decades.[7]

II

Compared to the obviously elite character of Progressive era school boards, the ward-based school boards of the nineteenth century are commonly seen by historians as bulwarks of democracy, opportunity, the poor, and the oppressed. While condemning Progressive era school boards for their elite backgrounds, many writers equate educational governance before the new era of centralization with representative democracy. By comparing and contrasting board membership in these cities for three separate census years (1870, 1880, and 1890), however, one can highlight the atypical social backgrounds of local school board members even before educational governing structures were further centralized at the turn of the century. Examining board membership at ten year intervals misses noncensus year membership but reveals long range trends in the social composition of school representatives.

What is striking about board membership over this twenty year period in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee is not the number of laborers or ordinary citizens who served on school boards but rather the preponderance of businessmen, manufacturers, and professionals. A so-called age of representative democracy was overrepresentative of the elite classes. All of these cities were becoming more industrial and therefore more working class during the period between 1870 and 1890. But school board membership did not noticeably include increased proportions of unskilled wage earners, skilled artisans, or white collar workers. In fact, unskilled laborers who comprised the bulk of the labor force never even served on these school boards. In addition, before the 1890s women in these cities were disenfranchised, blacks were never nominated for office, and school boards were therefore always all male and all white.[8]

Ward-based school boards were never comprised of the poor and dispossessed. They were primarily the bastion of small entrepreneurs or established businessmen, professionals, or manufacturers who actively engaged in a wide range of civic affairs. President McKelvey of the Rochester school board in 1892 characteristically asserted in his inaugural address that "most of the members of this board are businessmen, or men of experience in the management of affairs," and he urged them to put their private business talents to proper use as public servants.[9] "Our policy can be stated in four words--business on business principles," claimed one of McKelvey's contemporaries. "The board contains successful and honorable business and professional members."[10] Without benefit of detailed collective biographies of their peers, these men still spoke with authority. In 1870 businessmen and professionals comprised 71 percent of the total board membership, a figure which increased to 87 percent in 1880 and 88 percent in 1890. Though several white collar workers were found on some of these boards, they contained only two skilled workers, a carpenter and a machinist.[11]

The situation was remarkably similar in Toledo. The Rochester school board was elective, ward based, and increased in size from fourteen members in 1870 to sixteen members in 1890; Toledo's school board was similarly constituted except that it grew in twenty years from eight to nine members.[12] At the same time Toledo's business and professional membership was never smaller than 87 percent of the total number of members at each census year. Toledoans who were fortunate enough to get nominated to office by the major parties and then elected to serve were commonly referred to as "gentlemen" by contemporary writers.[13] One biographer, in reference to the decades-long presidency of Charles W. Hill, wrote with a characteristic sense of noblesse oblige that Mr. Hill made the perfection of the schools "the great hobby of his life."[14] It was indeed only one of his many diversions, for Hill was a land speculator, lawyer, politician, and original founding father of the schools in the 1840s. Less boisterous but equally telling was the appraisal of the wealthy German school board leader, Charles Zirwas, of Toledo's school board in 1890: "All the members at the present time are men who are themselves actively engaged in business affairs."[15]

The likelihood of broader public representation was only slightly improved on Milwaukee's school board, which grew from eighteen members in 1870 to twenty six members in 1880 to thirty six members ten years later. Milwaukee's boards were appointed by local aldermen rather than directly elected by the people.[16] The size of the board, however, is somewhat deceiving, since most of the important educational policy decisions were made by the executive committee, which only included half of the total membership for a given year. And even though Milwaukee had an estimated 38,000 wage earners by 1890, the city school board was still dominated by business and professional interests; they comprised 77 percent of the total membership in 1870, 71 percent in 1880, and 75 percent in 1890. As in other cities, white collar workers like petty clerks, cashiers, and bookkeepers in small businesses, banks, and manufacturing plants had a much better chance to serve than workers in less prestigious positions. Skilled workers were less likely to be found on the school board; and unskilled laborers were noticeably absent.[17] The degree to which these working people sought election to the school board is unknown, but Milwaukee's system of representation clearly favored businessmen and professionals.

The great virtue of the ward system in each of these cities was its geographically representative character, since all classes, races, and sexes were not proportionally represented. Local citizens occasionally expressed disgust and anger at the men who represented them (especially in Milwaukee, where the school board was not popularly elected). Still, the notion that each section of the city should have its own representative enjoyed wide popular support. In theory each local ward was equally important in decision making. Yet the theory did not always match the realities of school politics. By the 1890s, Populists, Socialists, trade unions, and liberal women together criticized the misappropriation of funds, condemned the poor physical conditions of working-class schools and neighborhoods, and in the process demonstrated that not every section of the town was treated equally.[18] Giving credence to this position, for example, was the last report issued by Toledo's ward-based school board. Writing in 1896, a prominent board member complained that the business districts had comfortable, well-lighted, and ventilated classrooms. Working-class children in the outlying wards, however, often held makeshift classes in "grocery rooms, empty stores, saloons, churches, alleys, and basements."[19]

A closer examination of those who served on nineteenth-century, ward-based school boards in places like Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee better explains why certain individuals took advantage of opportunities for educational leadership. Ward school boards were bastions of the small businessmen and professionals who had considerable visibility and prominence in local neighborhoods; of ethnic leaders who were not laborers but entrepreneurs and champions of business enterprise; and of neighborhood elites proud of their locale and in search of wider personal and social advancement. None of these cities ever had governing structures which permitted the industrial laboring classes to have much direct influence on official school policy. At-large elections simply ensured the continuation of this undemocratic condition in the twentieth century.[20]

The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle in 1898 cynically called the ward school board a "preparatory school for would be aldermen."[21] Cynicism aside, school board membership gave many aspiring political leaders their first footholds in public life. Numerous mayors, aldermen, county supervisors, and other public officials used school positions as springboards to greater political influence. The German-born Emil Wallber, the mayor who called out the Wisconsin National Guard during Milwaukee's Bay View Riots in 1886, earlier served on the school board. Milton Noyes, Rochester's school superintendent in the Nineties, was a lawyer who held the longest tenure on the ward school board. Guy Major, a candy manufacturer and linseed oil producer, gained prominence as a nativist hero of the American Protective Association; his high visibility on the Toledo school board, where he attacked Romanism in the schools, helped usher him into the mayoralty in the mid-Nineties.[22] The examples for different cities can easily be extended. With short tenure, the typical school board member under the ward system often viewed his position as a way station, a temporary office which would promote future success in social and political life.

For the majority of individuals, school board membership was often either a badge of social distinction or an indication of ambition or aspiration. That is not to demean the motives of individuals who sought recognition for themselves or for their ethnic group or social class in the larger political community. Like the men who had constructed these school systems, ward leaders were men of affairs--often neighborhood rather than cosmopolitan elites perhaps--but they were usually unrepresentative of the lower classes and exclusionary toward women and racial minorities. The businessmen who served on school boards prior to the onset of at-large elections were ordinarily not large manufacturers or major capitalists (though they were represented too); rather, they included the local jeweler, the grocer, the proprietor of the small cigar shop, even the local saloon keeper. They were not dispossessed men but small capitalists and entrepreneurs who dispensed beer, candy, fruit, groceries, and news to their friends and neighbors; they were individuals whose businesses served as crossroad meeting places for neighborhood discussions on public subjects and whose visibility and material success made them natural candidates for political office. In many ways, therefore, the early school boards reflected the social backgrounds of those who helped commercialize American life in the Gilded Age. By the same token, later school boards reflected not a nation of shopkeepers but rather the new wave of large scale businessmen, industrialists, and professionals who increasingly dominated the nation's political economy. Men who had risen through the ranks of the ward system rightly saw further centralization as a hindrance to their social mobility, an insult to their neighborhood, and a denial of opportunity and representative government.[23]

A definite shift in the types of representatives who served on urban school boards in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee occurred after the turn of the century. The local florist, grocer, hardware store owner, drugstore cashier, machinist, or railroad clerk who might have successfully served on ward school boards in many cities earlier lacked the personal and organizational resources necessary for success in at-large elections. Their personal contacts with voters were limited to a small geographical area and social group. Moreover, the support of the local ward heeler did little to influence the voters in cities with over 100,000 citizens. Hence it is not surprising that white and blue collar workers, who had only modest success under the ward system, were even less successful in many cities in the Progressive era. Milwaukee was one exception, since the Socialist working class ultimately controlled one-third of a fifteen member board after 1910. In other places like Kansas City, which had at-large elections since the 1870s, workers had never served on school boards from the earliest days of the schools, and trade union efforts to change the situation in an age of administrative centralization produced negligible results.[24]

In many respects Kansas City's school board in the nineteenth century was a sign of things to come in mass education. On its small, at-large elected board in 1870, 1880, and 1890, 100 percent of the positions were filled by businessmen and professionals, with a majority of the former in command. While small numbers of white collar and skilled workers served on ward-based school boards in many cities, Kansas City had an elite-dominated board from the very start. The first school board in 1867, for example, was comprised of William Sheffield, a prominent attorney who with Robert T. Van Horn orchestrated several "citizen's meetings" on education; Edward H. Allen, the Vice-President of the leading financial institution of Kansas City, the First National Bank; Thomas B. Lester, a physician who became the President of the Missouri State Medical Association; Joachim A. Bachman, a wealthy merchant; and Ephriam Spaulding and Henry C. Kumpfh, prosperous realtors. Census data for 1870 indicate that the average total wealth of these men was over $25,000, a sizeable fortune for these years. Moreover, their total wealth was slightly less than the average wealth of the first twenty two members of the Kansas City school board.[25]

"No other city in the country has placed continually year after year first class citizens on their school boards," exulted the Democratic Times in 1883.[26] In 1891 the Kansas City Star applauded Superintendent Greenwood's earlier role in convincing the Republican and Democratic parties to divide the school board between them, resulting in a bipartisan board which was usually called "non-partisan." "Kansas City took one of its occasionally wise steps when it raised its public schools above the arena of party strife," claimed the Star. The schools were not plagued "by the demands of saloonkeepers or any particular brand of business industry, by lifelong Democrats or lifelong Republicans, or by pigheaded individuals whose only claim to consideration is that they have always voted the straight ticket, and probably never have read it."[27] By the turn of the century leading Kansas Citians commonly wrote that the schools stood above "politics" and party strife, that only "the best and most honorable citizens" could serve, and that a school board election was "an honor bestowed only upon men of the highest standing in the community."[28]

Working people and ordinary citizens interpreted these developments very critically. In 1894 the working-class Mail published its usual but ineffective plea for new blood on the school board, and trade unions throughout the Progressive era who were snubbed by the major parties and defeated in third party bids aptly termed the school board the "Mutual Admiration Society."[29] Their resentment was well founded. Only thirty seven different individuals served on the Kansas City school board between 1867 and World War 1. Many individuals on the board enjoyed decades-long tenure. Almost all of the Kansas Citians on the board were businessmen and professionals, with large scale businessmen and financiers clearly in the lead; only one white collar worker, a railroad agent, served on the board during these five decades.[30]

A collective biography of this Mutual Admiration Society for these decades demonstrates that the average board member was usually elected to office in his early forties, was often native born (but usually not born in Missouri), and a man of considerable means and prominence. Even foreign-born members were wealthy and representative of the upper class. Several members of the board, like Patrick Shannon, E. H. Allen, Henry C. Kumpfh, R. H. Hunt, E. L. Martin, and Charles P. Chace were mayors of Kansas City in the late nineteenth century; many of the lawyers elected were Presidents of the Kansas City Bar Association; and numerous merchants were Presidents of the Board of Trade and the Commerce Club. Though the board was officially designated as non-partisan, it reflected as well as promoted the political ambitions and dominance of select individuals. These school board members had considerable social standing and political influence within the major parties; they were a metropolitan elite who formed an inner circle of prestige and power.[31]

The elite status of the Kansas City school board over the decades was promoted by the early establishment of at-large elections and a small school board, and it anticipated future trends in urban school governance in the Progressive era. Who should rule has always been a central issue in the annals of history, and it was never more important than in urban education in the Progressive era, when third party, Socialist, and working-class supporters clamored at the schoolhouse door with a variety of educational and social demands. The demise of the ward system in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee was swift, decisive, and full of social import. The fall of the ward system and the rise of Progressive school boards were ominous political developments as the Nineties finally drew to a close.

III

While presistently critical of Good Government leaders throughout the 1890s, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle finally admitted in 1899 that their plan for a small, city-wide elected school board deserved popular support as well as encouragement from the major political parties. "Public sentiment will unquestionably approve any change which has for its object the divorce, so far as may be practical, of school management and politics. The system of ward representation now in vogue necessarily gives undue prominence to ward politics in educational matters." The ward boards were marred by "scandals" and were "cumbersome and ineffective," while the proposed reorganization would yield "a more capable class of men."[32] In Toledo, both the Republican Blade and the more working-class, Democratic Evening Bee concluded a few years earlier that their city's ward based school board had also outlived its usefulness. The Democratic organ repeatedly enumerated the multiple sins committed by the board. Particularly distressing were the machinations of the school book monopoly, that "slimy octupus whose tentacles wind through and around all branches of our school system."[33]

Administrative change was also a pressing concern in Milwaukee. In 1897 a four-man commission appointed by the mayor sliced the existing school board in half. This reform produced a twenty-one member board chosen along ward lines. Still, the selection process yielded administrative officers with more elite backgrounds. One critic argued in the Educational Review in 1900 that this new board, compared to the older ones, "fails to be in as close touch with the people at large; is self-sufficient with reference to its attitude towards some educational problems; and is composed of the 'better classes,' so-called, a somewhat flexible and indefinite term, but used here to express wealth and social and political prestige--as opposed to democratic methods and democratic ideas. A board which goes to power by virtue of appointment by and [sic] thru another board could scarcely be otherwise."[34] Whether one looked in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, or a host of other cities, urban school governance had been reorganized by the early twentieth century. Traditional structures crumbled in an increasingly inhospitable atmosphere.

The details surrounding school board reorganization naturally varied in different cities, but the pattern of social change was unmistakeable. The ward system in the Rochester schools was dead by 1900. The same thing happened two years earlier in Toledo and, in 1897, Milwaukee's council-appointed system was similarly eliminated. Political scandals, financial corruption, and ineffective leadership by ward leaders, when coupled with the rising force of the reformers, spelled doom for the old ways. A new generation of professionals, businessmen, and especially manufacturers who were well represented in Good Government organizations ushered in a new age of school governance. They were aided by various grass-roots Progressive women's clubs and even temporarily by new political upstarts like Samuel M. "Golden Rule" Jones. Women reformers in particular remembered how rudely they were treated by ward heelers, who spat at their feet when they tried to vote, ripped up their ballots, and ridiculed them when they tried to expand their housekeeping talents in city government. At the turn of the century women learned that revenge was sweet.[35]

The actual amount of malfeasance in office by ward leaders prior to reorganization is notoriously difficult to estimate. Good Government leaders, aptly called the "Goo-Goo's" by their opponents, harped upon the need for "more efficiency and less politics" and corruption in the schools throughout the Nineties. The Goo-Goo's certainly had their own axes to grind, but chicanery and corruption were not unknown under the old system. As David Tyack has written, "The 'corruption' so frequently charged should not be dismissed as simply a code word for anti-immigrant or anti-Catholic feeling--though sometimes it was just that."[36] School contracts, teaching positions, janitor vacancies, textbook orders, and school supplies generally were a lucrative means of personal economic advance. In the 1880s Rochester's school commissioners used pseudonymns on business contracts in order to advance their own interests at the expense of the taxpayers. Billing procedures were slipshod; teachers were often forced to pay for their jobs, lacked formal tenure, and were also intimidated when they tried to vote after school suffrage was established for women.[37] Every city could tell the familiar tale of how nieces and nephews of school commissioners were favored in school appointments; or of how businessmen who submitted the lowest bid to complete work for the schools never received a contract. Dozens of school contracts in Rochester and other cities were vetoed by the mayor because boards often failed to advertise or accept competitive bids.[38]

Conditions had so deteriorated in Rochester by 1890 that the city council condemned the school commissioners for "reckless extravagance and loose business methods."[39] It then hired a special investigator to examine the commissioners' books and to explore various charges of peculation. John Bowers, an attorney who later joined the Good Government League, found a total disregard for itemizing school accounts, numerous examples of fraudulent payments, and sworn testimony by teachers that they had paid for their positions. The President of the school board was Milton Noyes, the future superintendent and an ally of the city's notorious Republican boss. He shrugged off the wide publicity against the ward system with a few profound words. "Intelligent criticism by the public and press is not so much against the system which renders peculation possible," he pointed out, "but rather against the selection of such Commissioners as would make such conditions probable."[40]

Quite mysteriously, nearly a thousand documents gathered by the prosecuting attorney disappeared right before the grand jury convened. The ward leadership had won its first round against an incipient Goo-Goo. Flush with success, school officials now more forcefully condemned those who only uncovered "petit larceny on a ten-cent basis" and could not even prove minor allegations in court. Ward leaders refused to be "gibbetted at the crossroads of public opinion."[41] To show that it had not lost its sense of humor, the school board then resolved to purchase a safe in which to store their precious documents. This symbolic gesture of defiance only steeled the resolve of the opposition.[42]

Contracts, teaching positions, and school house construction in Toledo also provided lucrative sources for graft. By the late Nineties normally competitive Republican and Democratic newspapers together regarded the ward system as an anachronism. The most scandalous affair emerged in 1897 when Superintendent A. A. McDonald, a married man, was seen in a Cleveland hotel with a prostitute. He was supposedly on a "business" trip and she was reportedly a gift from the American Book Company. When the school board refused to censure, discipline, or remove McDonald from office, it caused a scandal across the city, producing vitriolic speeches from the pulpit and lurid headlines in the press.[43] The ward aldermen even passed a mock resolution which read, "Resolved, That as the board of education has, by its action, lost the respect of all citizens and there is no further reason for its existence, that the governor be requested to call out the militia for the purpose of shooting all the members."[44]

Milwaukee's school board had a special way of handling its own corrupt public servants, adding fuel to public discontent and legitimacy to some of the Municipal League's criticisms of the ward system. Over the decades citizens had read occasional complaints in both English and foreign language newspapers of graft and corruption in the schools. There were charges of fraudulent billing practices, conflicts of interest among businessmen on the board of education, and the perennial problem of nepotism in teacher hiring and promotion. Nothing, however, matched the Schattenberg affair that began in the late Eighties.[45]

August Schattenberg was a well respected German who served as secretary of the school board. He was also a crook. In less than two years he stole over $40,000 from the operating budget to cover sizeable gambling debts, money which was sorely needed for the overcrowded schools. What infuriated many Milwaukeeans was not simply the discovery of malfeasance but the response of the school board to his behavior. Ward leaders exhibited notoriously bad taste when they cancelled classes and ordered school flags at half mast on the day of Schattenberg's funeral; he had committed suicide when his misdeeds were uncovered, leaving no one for the district attorney to prosecute. Parent and citizen groups held indignation meetings across the city, many principals and teachers refused to cancel their classes for the fallen hero, and a resolution by the city council to censure the school board for its actions failed by one vote.[46] One educator in the Wisconsin Journal of Education wryly noted: "the old story is repeated--'a good fellow'--gambling--misuse of funds--'doctored' accounts--theft--forgery--suicide."[47]

Through such actions by the ward based school boards of Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee, advocates of school reorganization along the lines of "efficient" and "non-partisan" administrative governance gathered additional strength. Paralleling the rise of the women's clubs, Socialist and Populist parties, resurgent trade unions, and Social Gospelers in the Nineties were Good Government Clubs which evolved in cities across the country. Dedicated to civil service reforms and business efficiency, these organizations were dominated by new business and professional interest groups. In Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and other cities, they led the charge against ward leadership in the schools.[48]

Joseph T. Alling, a young liberal industrialist who ran Rochester's largest adult Bible class, helped form the local Good Government League in 1893. The League advocated efficiency and honesty in city government, especially the schools. During the same year both the Good Government League of Toledo and the Milwaukee Municipal League also organized; both groups fought for the principle of civil service in municipal hiring practices. As early as 1892, Kansas City also had its own Municipal Improvement Association; it was later renamed the Municipal Reform Committee. Though "ward politics" had never affected their schools, these Kansas Citians as well as their peers in other cities wanted to revolutionize municipal government, whether in the city council chambers or in local boards of education.[49]

As in so many other areas of social and political development, the Nineties was once again a key period in the changing nature of urban schooling. Administrative changes during these years greatly affected the nature of educational reform for the next two decades. While working-class, third party, and female challenges against the existing social order were registered throughout this decade, a reaction to the excesses of the ward system and possible political threats from below motivated new business and professional forces to consolidate their control over specific aspects of education and politics. "Good government," "efficiency," and "non-partisanship" were the slogans of these elite groups in their war against the ward bosses, but their underlying commitment to the preservation of a hierarchical social structure ultimately made them enemies of all urban radicals.

Just where the various grass-roots' forces would align on administrative reform was a critical historical issue on the local urban scene.

IV

Disillusioned Rochesterians suggested various ways to eliminate ward politics in the schools in the early Nineties. In 1894 the Women's Educational and Industrial Union urged the election of a University of Rochester professor to the school board to help raise the standard of decision making.[50] A recently revived Citizens Educational Association, comprised mostly of University of Rochester faculty members, returned the favor and urged the establishment of a five member board, with the stipulation that three members of the board would be elected at large, that two would be appointed by the mayor, and that at least two representatives would always be women.[51]

The Rochester Herald, in turn, offered the alternative conceived by the Republican boss and current mayor, George Aldridge. Aldridge agreed that the school board was too large and unwieldy, dispersing authority and undermining accountability. Attorney Bowers' investigation and the school board's response testified to the need for immediate action. In a spirit of public service, Aldridge proposed a small board which would be appointed by him. Since the Rochester school board was overwhelmingly Republican in the Nineties, Aldridge's plan seems to have been to reduce the size of the board, keep it Republican, and extend his personal control over the G.O.P. Aldridge's future actions demonstrated that he had little fear of centralized administrations, for under the right circumstances they were even easier to manipulate than larger ward-based bodies. For now, however, his party newspaper expressed the popular view that "upon one point all are agreed. The present board of education is too large for practical purposes, and radical changes are absolutely necessary."[52]

While the Republican boss, the Goo-Goo's, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, the Citizens Educational Association, and the city council discussed ways to dismantle the ward-elected board, the school commissioners responded with expected anger and refused to entertain any ideas of reorganization. They took their stand on the principle of geographical representation in democratic polity. At the same time, when the city council suggested a plan for a smaller board in 1894, the present administration responded that it would only introduce "politics" in the schools.[53] As the pressure mounted for social change, from the demands for new subjects by women's organizations to more threatening proposals for administrative reorganization, the ward board continued to argue that the present system held "the affections of our citizens" and that a change from ward elections would constitute taxation without representation. President Brownwell added in 1895 that contrary to some reports "there was no public demand for a change in our school system."[54]

By 1898 some form of administrative reorganization seemed imminent, regardless of the wishes of the existing school board. Despite considerable evidence to the contrary, ward leaders contended that they were never consulted on any proposed reorganization plans; in fact, prominent school board representatives vocally attacked any proposals for change and discredited some attempts within the board to compromise with their enemies.[55] At times the ward board sent out contradictory messages to the citizenry. On the one hand, it usually asserted that the ward system was unassailable if democratic government continued, and on the other hand it sometimes took the opposite position. In 1898 the board president attacked reform legislation but added that "all concede that a small board, consisting of three to five members, whether elective or appointive...might result to the city's benefit."[56] While ward politicians failed to act in concert, their enemies struck quickly and decisively.

Rochester's ward-based school board was the victim of a political agreement struck between Boss Aldridge and the Good Government League. By mid-decade the Goo-Goo's had gathered sufficient strength to deny the Aldridge machine several municipal offices, including the mayoralty. The schools were a convenient and lucrative source of patronage for loyal Republicans, but

Aldridge decided to cooperate with the Goo-Goo's on the issue of school centralization in exchange for a free hand in other areas of municipal politics. Good government workers drafted the Dow Bill in 1898, which provided for a five member school board elected at large, to take effect in 1900, and Aldridge then helped shephard it through the state legislature. In May of 1898 Aldridge personally explained the virtues of the Dow Bill to Governor Theodore Roosevelt, who signed it into law.[57]

Aldridge's longevity as a political boss in Rochester in the Progressive era rested on his ability to adapt to changing social forces and to utilize them for his own ends. At the very time in which he was destroying the ward basis of school representation, he increased his control over the Board of Estimate, which approved the educational budget. In that way Aldridge gave to the Goo-Goo's with one hand and stole power away from them with the other. Moreover, Aldridge deftly altered part of the Dow Bill when it reached the state printer. Without consulting the Good Government League, he added a clause that gave his old Republican crony, Milton Noyes, a guaranteed position as superintendent on the reorganized board. The Goo-Goo's were incensed by this political sting. Only after the new board demonstrated that Noyes had been dipping into the school fund for personal uses was he forced to resign. A master politician, Aldridge had eliminated a pack of fellow Republicans from the school board through his alliance with Good Government forces on centralization, but in the process he had actually dealt himself a new hand.[58]

Like Rochester, Toledo similarly witnessed a fatal blow against ward representation in the schools late in the 1890s. During earlier years of the decade various proposals surfaced on how to best restructure the school board and remove it from "politics." As in other cities undergoing comparable social reconstruction, it is clear that reformers were simply replacing one form of politics with another.[59] The Toledo Board of Education typically opposed administrative reforms and called for a preservation of the existing system. This was unlikely since a number of different proposals to establish a "non-partisan" board gained momentum during these years.

Guy Major presented the first serious recommendation for political change in 1896. Like Aldridge of Rochester, Major was a local Republican leader. Unlike his New York counterpart, Major built his support in Toledo on a somewhat narrow and ephemeral issue: anti-Catholicism. Nativism had a recurrent appeal to the voters throughout the Progressive era, having its strongest expression in Toledo during the mid-Nineties when the American Protective Association helped catapult Major to the mayoralty. Major hated Catholics as well as suffrage leaders and women's organizations that meddled in school affairs during this earlier tenure on the school board. As a strategy to remove the few remaining Catholics from the school board, he proposed that the mayor henceforth appoint a small board and replace the ward structure. Women's clubs, trade unions, Populists, and even the Chamber of Commerce joined hands and prevented the passage of Major's "ripper bill" in Columbus.[60]

Within two years, however, Good Government reformers used the pretext of Superintendent McDonald's escapades in Cleveland and the exposure of various forms of peculation in the schools to destroy the ward system. Like Rochester's reform movement, Toledo's effort at administrative reorganization ultimately enjoyed bipartisan support and approval from business, manufacturing, and professional interests.[61] In the name of efficiency, progress, and educational advance, normally rival editors like Robinson Locke of the Republican Blade and Negley Cochran of the Democratic Evening Bee popularized the cause of administrative reform. "There have been jobs in school books; jobs in school buildings; jobs in furniture; jobs in everything that could be subject to jobbery," claimed the Blade in a typical denunciation of political logrolling and corruption in the schools.[62] "Purify the schools. Dump the politicians. Fire out the book and supply companies. Get rid of bribers and men who want to be bribed. Wipe off the slate. Clean out both factions. Run the schools in the interest of the scholars," added Locke's usual adversary, the Evening Bee.[63]

Through dozens of articles and editorials, these major newspapers vigorously assaulted ward leadership in the schools. They featured stories on specific examples of malfeasance, of interference in decision making by the American Book Company, and of low morale among the teaching staff. In that way the press cultivated a congenial climate for reform, one which permitted a relatively small band of citizens to convince the legislature to approve the Niles Bill in 1898. Named for the Democratic legislator who drafted the bill, it replaced the ward-based board with a five member school board elected at large without party designations on the ballot. With the support of Good Government reformers and various Progressives, the Niles Bill was widely heralded as the turning point in the history of the schools and the beginning of a new era in educational administration.[64]

A number of prominent members of the Toledo Chamber of Commerce formed a delegation in Columbus to support the Niles Bill, including George W. Writner, a realtor who was its Secretary, and W. H. Chase, a business executive with Aetna Insurance. Aiding the cause were a number of suffrage leaders and the new Christian Socialist mayor, Samuel M. "Golden Rule" Jones, who wanted to infuse the spirit of "non-partisanship" throughout municipal government. Jones fully realized that none of the leading commercial organizations shared his larger concerns with social and educational reconstruction, and the Chamber of Commerce, wealthy congregations, both major parties, and many businessmen ultimately denounced his pro-labor campaign platforms.[65]

For a variety of reasons, however, Jones also attacked the ward system and supported administrative reorganization. He was attracted to the idea of direct nomination, which meant that any citizen with several hundred signatures on a petition could run for office. Jones was himself the darkhorse candidate of the Republicans for mayor in 1897, but he soon left the party and refused to run on any party ticket for his remaining political career; in 1899, he captured every ward in the city without the support of any newspaper or endorsement by any political party.

Jones saw the removal of school offices from the clutches of the Republican and Democratic Party as an exercise in direct democracy and the only way in which women might gain election to the school board. When the Niles Bill took effect in 1898, almost forty individuals ran for office, more than was true under the ward system in the past, and several of the candidates were women.[66]

The Central Labor Union was deeply divided on the reorganization plan. A vocal minority of the affiliates of the organization applauded the idea of direct nomination, but more prescient workers declared in the Toledo Union that "organized labor can do more in individual wards toward the defeat of an enemy than in the city at large."[67] When "Golden Rule" Jones endorsed the eight hour day, the municipal ownership of utilities, the end of contract labor by the city, minimum wage legislation, pensions, child labor legislation, and public works projects for the poor and the unemployed, the trade unions stood firmly by his side. Many letters in Jones' manuscript collection indicate widespread trade union endorsement for his political stands, and he became a hero of the laboring masses, one of the most beloved figures in Toledo's history. But on the reorganization plan of 1898, labor leaders had more foresight than Jones. It was to the Golden Rule Mayor's credit that he joined with parents groups, women's organizations, and the Central Labor Union in 1904 and successfully petitioned the state legislature for some district representation on the school board.[68]

Many ward school members in Toledo, like their counterparts in Rochester and Milwaukee, fought strenuously to preserve the old order. Some small businessmen rightly saw their personal avenues of political advancement blocked by the Niles Bill; others undoubtedly disliked the loss of patronage, kickbacks, and power that made ward leaders respected men in their neighborhoods; and still others opposed the reorganization scheme on democratic principles. William Tucker, for example, denounced the reformers as elitists and demanded the preservation of the existing educational governing structure. Tucker was the

President of the William McKinley Club, the President of the school board, a prosperous attorney, a banker, a philanthropist, and a city postmaster from 1898 to 1916. He resented the much publicized claim that all ward leaders were grafters and he vigorously opposed the Niles Bill.[69]

"I believe that the nearer you can get to the people in the matter of selecting of members of our board, the better it will be, otherwise our American system of choosing officers is a failure," he contended in 1898 in a speech against school reorganization.[70] Tucker warned that the rich would dominate on future school boards, "while the out-lying districts and the districts containing the great laboring portion of our citizens would be neglected, and these sections are the ones that especially need representation...for the wealthy and well-to-do classes are able to secure proper educational advantages for their children, while the poor people are compelled to rely upon our public school system."[71] While preferring district over ward or at large elections, Tucker did not explain how inequalities based on class and sex would necessarily be altered through his plan, but in time labor leaders and Progressives like Golden Rule Jones fully agreed with Tucker on the undesirable social consequences of small, at-large elections.[72]

Like the ward boards of Rochester and Toledo, the method of selecting school commissioners in Milwaukee reached back to the 1840s yet proved vulnerable to Good Government centralization reform in the late Nineties. By then the Municipal League of Milwaukee had a reputation as one of the most potent Good Government associations in the nation. With the aid of William Geuder, a prominent German and Republican leader on the school board, the Municipal League in 1897 convinced the Grand Old Party to endorse legislation that eliminated the system by which board members were appointed by local aldermen; in its place stood a twenty-one member ward-based board that was appointed by a special four-man commission named by the mayor.[73] The plan was condemned by the emergent Socialist trade union movement as well as by more moderate working-class groups and small entrepreneurs attracted to the Populist

Party. In both the German Socialist Vorwarts and the Populist Daily News, citizens encountered biting commentary on school centralization that never reached such heights in many cities.

The aldermen-appointed, ward-based school board of Milwaukee long opposed any shift from the status quo, especially the popular election of its members. The board was insulated from public opinion in the sense that it was not directly elected by the people. In that way ward members were as distrustful of the electorate as the Goo-Goo's, and they opposed the persistent demands of working-class groups for an elective school board. From the 1870s to the early twentieth century, when it helped establish direct elections, the Socialist working class in particular rallied other grass-roots organizations against all appointive schemes and in favor of more democratic structures.[74]

In 1872 the Milwaukee school board typically attacked working-class pressure for a directly elected board, claiming it would only draw the schools into a "political arena."[75] In the late 1880s and early 1890s the appointed board rejected similar suggestions for reorganization by external pressure groups. Still smarting in the mid-Nineties from the popular backlash over the Schattenberg affair, the ward board was further criticized when citizens exposed a number of shady financial and real estate deals involving schoolhouse construction. Moreover, the board now had to deal with "faddists" and School Alliance women, the Municipal League, which wanted civil service extended to the schools, the Daily News and the Vorwarts, which wanted large, ward-based boards that were popularly elected, and the Milwaukee Sentinel, a particularly powerful voice for Republicanism and Good Government values.[76]

The ward-appointed board had its back against the wall and only aggravated the situation by refusing to compromise with external forces for reform. It regularly insulted members of the Women's School Alliance for their meddling and soft pedagogical ideas; it rejected all the proposals of the Municipal League; it opposed suggestions for direct election since it would foster "politics" in education; and it voted against a proposal which would have prohibited nepotism in hiring practices.[77] The board that refused to bend was broken in 1897, even though many grassroots Progressives opposed the appointive aspect of the Municipal League's reorganization plan. One of the main objectives of the Socialist working class in Milwaukee in the next several years was to dismantle this reform and provide direct election of the school board. The Socialists were ultimately aided by many women's organizations and parent groups, including the Woman's School Alliance, and it was one of their major successes later in the Progressive era.

The Populists and the Socialists were nevertheless the only consistent opponents of the Municipal League in Milwaukee in the Nineties. Neither group liked the aldermen-appointed nature of the current board of education nor the belief that a four man commission would adequately promote their interests. Ideologically distinct, the Populists and the Socialists often endorsed similar educational programs during these years: free lunches, textbooks, more district high schools, lecture programs, and the free and unrestricted use of the neighborhood school as a community center. These largely working-class groups wanted the schools closer to the people, and they disliked the idea that politicians from the other side of town would control the mayoral commission and choose their school representatives.[78]

Upon learning of the commission plan in 1897, the Daily News called for the establishment of three separate district school boards in Milwaukee, directly elected by the people, who would also elect a larger, ward-based school board to guide the educational affairs of the entire city.[79] The Municipal League rejected the plan as inefficient and the school board called it impractical. The Socialist Vorwarts had less well developed proposals but similar contempt for the Goo-Goo's. Along with the Populists, the Socialists attacked the allegedly "nonpartisan" commission as a fraud, since the mayor packed the four man commission with elite members of society as well as his own political partisans. "If we understand the facts correctly, the object of the law was to steer highly political people away from the school board," wrote Victor Berger in 1897. "But it's obvious that this 'capitalist reform' should be simply relegated to the manure heap of political life."[80]

These articulate forms of opposition did not prevent school reorganization in Milwaukee. And, as in other cities, clubwomen whose supposedly non-partisan and feminine qualities poorly equipped them for the strenuous job of school politics aided in the demise of older patterns of school governance. Women's clubs would often cooperate with trade unions, Socialists, Populists, and other political organizations on a wide range of social service reforms in the schools in the Progressive era, but in the Nineties they opposed these groups on the question of school board reorganization. Drawn from more comfortable classes, women were less concerned with ward or district representation, and they drove the stake deep into the heart of the ward system whenever they were given an opportunity. They never forgot how ward leaders had insulted them, ignored them at party caucuses, and intimidated them at the polls. The New Woman had little to lose with the destruction of the ward system, which she rightly perceived as a bastion of maleness and a deterrent to the new housekeeping.

In Rochester the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, the Local Council of Women, and various suffragettes forcefully backed the Dow Bill in 1898, and Helen Montgomery in particular rallied support against the old system.[81] Toledo's Emily Bouton, a central figure in the Women's Educational Club and other organizations, joined with Mary Law and other clubwomen in support of the Niles Bill a year earlier. Shunned by the major parties in the Nineties, Toledo women viewed the direct nomination features of the reorganization plan as the only hope for female representation on the school board. Miss Bouton in particular likened the local fight for reform to Jane Addams' more famous struggles against Johnny Powers, a powerful ward adversary.[82] The Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee, tired of its token position on the school board and properly suspicious of local aldermen on the area of women's rights, similarly cast its lot with the Municipal League. The Socialist working class would help radicalize many of the members of the Woman's Alliance over the years, finally encouraging them to push for an elective school board. In the Nineties, however, the Alliance seemed to enjoy its victory over the ward bosses.[83]

By the turn of the century, then, women as well as more influential Good Government reformers restructured school administrations in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee. They built the framework with which parents, reformers, and radicals of all stripes would have to contend in the twentieth century. The question of who would formally rule in urban education in these cities was partially settled as the new century dawned. The consequences of administrative change would reverberate not only in the early decades of the twentieth century but continue to this very day. At-large elections of school boards comprised of small numbers of elite individuals dominate contemporary urban schooling, and it is one of the great ironies of educational history that this mode of school governance was perfected in a so-called age of improvement and progress.

The ward-based school boards of the nineteenth century offer one alternative to the present model of urban school governance. This older system never guaranteed that all classes, sexes, and races would have proportional representation. It did ensure, however, that every section of the city would have at least one local representative on a central board. Ward members were not comprised of the down cast victims of industrial capitalism, even though district or local representation remains a viable principle in democratic theory. Ward boards were plagued with problems related to patronage, tyranny over teachers, graft, and alliances with corrupt business interests. Centralized school boards, of course, were never immune from these problems, and it is difficult to believe that the Mutual Admiration Societies that existed in many cities after the Progressive era were distinct improvements on their predecessors.

Introduction To Part III

"The thought of social service is in the air," claimed an advocate of social centers in the School Journal. "It is a well defined sentiment. Where should this sentiment be seen crystallizing into action? Above all places in the common schools."[1] Certainly the common schools among other important social institutions were cast into a whirlwind of reform and social change during the early twentieth century. The crisis of the 1890s, indicated in widespread community and social strife and reflected so well by struggles over school centralization, was only a harbinger of future controversies in urban education. Whether school reformers on the grass-roots sought social service, social control, or both, individuals who had little else in common agreed on the need for immediate alterations in educational policy. And, between 1900 and 1920, the major partisans of grass-roots Progressivism finally reached political maturity. Women's clubs, parent teacher associations, labor unions, Socialists and warriors from the Populist crusade, neighborhood groups and city wide organizations, as well as professional and business associations, engaged in continual rounds of conflict and debate over who would shape, control, and benefit from the local neighborhood school.

The study of Progressive reform has for too long centered on uncovering a particular "reform type" responsible for the multitudinous changes of the early twentieth century. Some scholars have variously interpreted Progressivism as a movement of the "new middle class", of businessmen and corporate elites, of men and women searching for lost status, and even of the immigrant masses dominant in large urban areas.[2] What is striking about the study of urban schooling in the Progressive era is how these interpretations oversimplify the complexity of reform during these years. As much of this study has indicated, reform movements were comprised of different strands of community protest and activism, and no particular social group or political or occupational interest can be seen as the full expression of "Progressive reform." As a result of the interaction between competing voluntary groups, of course, the state through its local educational units expanded its role in social welfare. State expansion was the common denominator in the activities of municipal Progressives, though the exact way in which the state should express itself through educational innovation remained a source of controversy and debate throughout the early twentieth century.

In highlighting one particular social or occupational group as the key element in urban Progressivism, historians have overlooked the diverse character of social change during these seminal years. What is needed is a more dialectical, interactive interpretation of change. The history of grass-roots school reform during these years is not a tale of how one group imposed its values on the rest of the community. It was a period of intense political conflict, when competing groups found themselves warmly agreeing on some issues but violently disagreeing on others. People drawn from different social backgrounds and with contrasting political perspectives actively participated in school reform movements from the 1890s onward in cities like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. And, as we shall see, contrary to much current historical literature, the implementation of school social services like school lunches or social centers cannot be easily dismissed as examples of "social control" or elite reform: the plain fact is that people with different motives and world views, like bankers, reform-oriented ministers, labor unions, Socialists, and other citizens for their own reasons all desired these educational improvements.

To say that many diverse groups participated in reforms that expanded the social functions of mass education is not to argue that each group that did so was equally powerful and influential in the shaping of educational policy. For example, if laboring interests were as united and powerful as professional and business interests in local communities, school board centralization would never have proceeded with such alacrity at the turn of the century. And the intentions of school reformers, no matter how divergent, tell us little about how new school programs actually functioned, what they meant in children's lives, and what if any differences they made in controlling youth or in broadening the bounds of opportunity. Yet the history of the expansion of school social services in particular was not any simple movement of businessmen, or professionals, or middle class women; neither was it simply some simple movement from above or below. A wide range of groups competed and cooperated on the implementation of new school innovations, all of which aimed to enhance the school's power vis-a-vis the family. Urban schools adopted a vast array of innovations: health related reforms like breakfasts, lunches, and medical and dental inspection; educational and recreational reforms like vacation schools and playgrounds; and more multi-faceted reforms like social centers.

The centralization of urban school boards, one of the most vital changes of these years, was never universally accepted by different community groups as final in the early twentieth century. There were struggles for more decentralized governing structures and open assaults on elite leadership in the schools. But school politics and educational reform ranged broadly beyond the important issue of who would control the school board: the neighborhood or city at large. The turn of the century witnessed the proliferation of proposals from many individuals who wanted to expand the social role of schooling. And so, in an atmosphere shaped by competing elements of the grass-roots, school reform in a very broad sense remained vital to people from many different backgrounds in numerous cities. The issue for many individuals was not whether but how they could improve different characteristics of the urban school.

An Age Of Municipal Reform

Haste, oh haste, delightful morning
  Of that glorious freedom day,
When from earth's remotest border
  Tyrants all have passed away;
When we shall for service render
  Service of an equal worth;
Then will all mankind be brothers,
  Heav'n then will have come to earth.
          Samuel M. Jones

Many believe that the people should
live as dogs and fleas--that those
who are not sucking blood should be
scratching themselves, and that all
ought to be contented it should
ever be thus.
     Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 1903

I

The movement for playgrounds, vacation schools, social centers, medical and dental inspection, nutrition programs, and other welfare reforms constituted the educational phase of larger social and political transformations in urban communities throughout the Progressive era. The early twentieth century was one of those fascinating eras when people with widely varying backgrounds believed that social improvement, however defined and interpreted, was desirable and even possible, especially through schooling. Any appreciation of educational reform must therefore begin with the broader social and political context for change that prevailed in places like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. For it was not schoolmen and educators per se who led movements for Progressive school reform; rather, the major sources for educational change remained rooted not in the schools but in the communities that sustained them. School reform, of course, ultimately depended on how school boards, administrators, and teachers responded to many-sided calls for improvement. Patterns of educational change were nevertheless continually shaped by competing grass-roots activists and by local climates of reform.

School board centralization marked only the first round of school reform in the Progressive era. Just as the issue of centralization repeatedly provoked considerable debate after the Nineties, partisans for change thereafter would continually interact on important educational policy issues. Always somewhat dependent upon the novel ideas of various community groups, the schools were habitually subjected to scrutiny and criticism on the grass-roots: by the New Women, the Social Gospelers, activist trade union leaders, and representatives of the professions and business. Although different groups often represented particular social and political interests, voluntary associations led the most important movements for social and political change, always forming the broad context for educational reform. Liberals struggled to remove some of the worst aspects of contemporary urban life through various social programs; conservatives condemned them for undermining private initiative and responsibility at the state's expense; and radicals condemned all of them for their supposedly narrow social vision and refusal to redistribute wealth and power in local communities.[1]

A wide range of individuals in this age of intense citizen activism viewed schooling as a main vehicle of progress and social improvement. "This is a great age for the phenomenal growth of organizations," noted the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, and schooling became a major concern for countless voluntary associations.[2] Citizens formed a consensus on the value of schooling but were still deeply divided on who would determine the pace, nature, and quality of educational innovation in the modern world. In the broadest sense, there were two opposite movements in urban education in the early twentieth century. On the one hand, administrative, elite reformers centralized school boards and thereby eliminated district representation and neighborhood control. School superintendents in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and other cities in different degrees soon became more visible and significant in educational policy. Control over teacher hiring, the most visible symbol of the power of ward school commissioners, now shifted to educational experts. For these and other reasons many historians follow David B. Tyack's assertion that the Progressive era was an age of "the one best system," one of elite dominance and administrative supremacy.[3] Places like Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee only reflected the national trend toward school board reorganization and centralized control, and Kansas City's small school board similarly remained under the control of elite professional and business interests.

The centralization of urban school boards reflected the drive for business efficiency in the Progressive era, but it was never universally welcomed by all citizens. New school leaders increasingly came from elite classes and school administrations grew more distant from the people, triggering numerous outbursts of opposition from different community interests. Trade unions, Socialists, and ethnic minorities in particular condemned the reorganized structure of school governance, viewing the "non-partisan" rhetoric of Good Government reformers as an ideological cloak that poorly concealed a personal quest for power. Many women's organizations who were active in social welfare reforms were less critical of elite dominance, except when efficiency advocates and fiscal conservatives ignored the need for additional social services and curricular innovations. But whether or not different grass-roots forces agreed on the abolishment of ward representation, all of these interests joined in an effort to expand the social functions of urban education. On many occasions these grass-roots forces retained some of their own unique identities and yet united to promote a number of new social services in the urban schools.

These reform-minded men and women endeavored in Deweyian fashion to make the local school a center of neighborhood activities and social and intellectual stimulation. Like Dewey, they hoped to make the school "a center of full and adequate social service, to bring it completely into the current of social life" as well as to transform it into a place for "the continuous education for all classes for whatever ages."[4] Through regular interaction and clashes between school board elites and lay reformers of different political persuasions, the mission of the schools broadened to include a wide range of services and innovations. Lawrence Cremin, of course, called this process part of "the transformation of the school."[5] Whether schools were indeed "transformed" will be examined more closely in later chapters, but the schools did serve as a major focal point for many progressive reformers. For many the schools became the great lever of reform and social betterment.

Although historians like David B. Tyack have well documented the thrust of administrative centralization during these years, little is known about how various school programs and innovations altered the social life of many urban systems. For example, the schools broadened their responsibilities for the health and welfare of children. Vacation schools, playgrounds, athletic leagues, medical and dental inspection, vaccination, and breakfast and lunch programs were common issues of educational debate and policy.

Special schools for the blind, deaf, crippled, feeble-minded, anemic, and tubercular offered alternatives to state institutions far from home. Curricular innovations like kindergartens, manual training and domestic science programs, and pre-vocational classes and trade training also began in many urban systems. While many cities of small and middling size had only a single tax-supported secondary school in the nineteenth century, demand from outlying districts of the city forced the establishment of hundreds of district high schools. Evening schools, social centers, and public lecture programs rounded out the reform platforms of many community leaders on the school board and in the city at large.[6]

Judgements on these programs widely differed among contemporaries, and historians continue to debate their merits. Whether viewed from the perspective of the past or present, school policy makers at the turn of the century grappled with problems of far-reaching significance: from the effort to end neighborhood representation through school board centralization to the movement to expand schooling beyond the Three R's through social welfare reform. For historians of social change in education in the Progressive era, many central questions remain unanswered. Did Progressive era school boards, now increasingly operating on a model of business efficiency, deliver to any notable degree worthwhile services to their clientele? Did centralized school boards retard or advance the pace of innovations like social centers and nutritional programs? Were working-class or radical groups effective in any particular areas of school reform, or did centralized school administrations deny them influence in shaping public policy? In what ways and on what issues did women and different voluntary associations interact on school matters with Socialists and laborers?

The answers to these questions help determine whether the Progressive era was, as historians have suggested, primarily an age of elite ascendance or liberal social transformation. History is of course rarely as straight-forward as it first appears; it is full of unexpected twists and turns, odd facts, and unpredictable personalities and events. Who could predict the conversion of Samuel M. Jones from a conservative manufacturer to a Golden Rule mayor? Who could predict that Socialists and Populists, rare political species in the 1890s, would become integral leaders in many facets of local educational reform? Who could predict whether lay people and grass-roots reformers would counter the moves of administrative elites and make the schools a greater source of social service and public welfare? By tracing the process of interaction between community groups and school leaders, one can better appreciate the process of social change that affected school policy at the turn of the century. Then one can better explain whether centralized administrations treated all parents and children equitably, whether at-large elections produced leaders who represented a broad spectrum of the citizenry, or whether administrative reform ensured special privileges for wealthy citizens.

Against a backdrop of increased industrial development, changing patterns of immigration, population growth, and newly-structured school boards, grass-roots Progressives in many cities vied for influence in school decision making in the early twentieth century. But here such generalizations must be further elaborated upon and clarified. Trade unions everywhere made important bids for political power and representation on school boards, though only Milwaukee's unusually strong Socialist working-class movement enabled specific laboring groups to achieve success worthy of their numbers. Milwaukee's Social Democratic Party demonstrated the centrality of third party forces in municipal life in the Progressive era. Religious-oriented pressures for social change also contributed to the development of third party activism in different cities, especially in Toledo. There Golden Rule Jones best embodied the new religious spirit in public office. Between 1897 and 1904, Jones symbolized the power of the Social Gospel in urban politics. After Jones' death, his legacy continued under mayor Brand Whitlock (1905-1913) and the Independents. They promoted many of Jones' municipal programs, expanded them into broader directions, and essentially retained

Progressive schooling as the educational phase of larger political and social reform.[7]

Rochester and Kansas City had contrasting political environments compared with Toledo and Milwaukee. They lacked such well defined, cohesive, and successful Socialist, working-class, or politico-religious movements that congealed for any notable period of time. Like dissidents and third party activists elsewhere, Rochester's and Kansas City's Socialist parties and trade union organizations sought more influence in politics and school decision-making after the turn of the century. They fought for many new social services for children, aspired to leadership on local school boards, and sought social justice for unrepresented groups.

Very often these outsiders of the established political system failed to unite successfully against the status quo. Boss Aldridge of Rochester, for example, regularly undermined their influence. Aldridge grew tired of shared governance with the Goo-Goo's who served on the school board after the turn of the century. By denying them nomination to office through the Republican party, he eliminated Good Government leaders from the school board after 1910. As a result, Aldridge controlled the Republican school board just as he had in the Nineties. Aldridge did not replace Goo-Goo's on the school board with Socialists, workers, or political radicals. Instead, he continued the policy of nominating only a few "best" men to office--as long as they were loyal and conservative Republicans.

Rochester's schools witnessed many curricular reforms and social service innovations with the encouragement of Good Government forces, especially in the area of social centers, for which the city became nationally renowned. But Boss Aldridge consolidated his power against both liberals, Socialists, and trade union leaders who threatened his dominance.[8] Workers and radicals also struggled for representation on the Kansas City school board during the Progressive era with negligible results. A small band of elite businessmen and professionals had controlled the schools since the 1870s with Superintendent James Greenwood at the helm, a pattern that continued in the new century. After Greenwood retired in 1914, his post was filled by I. I. Cammack, best known for his opposition to teacher unions and his support for the Gary plan of industrial education and vocationalism for the working classes.[9]

First attaining widespread recognition in the Nineties, organized women remained avid school reformers in the majority of American cities. Despite their frequent appeals to "non-partisanship," women joined voluntary organizations by the millions by World War I and became involved in numerous political activities. Groups like the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, the Toledo Educational Club, the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee, and the Kansas City Athenaeum--to name only the most prominent organizations in these cities--mirrored grass-roots changes across the urban nation. The Rochester _Union and Advertiser_ did not exaggerate when it argued in 1899 that "there are so many organizations of women...that it is not easy to distinguish and keep track of them."[10] Like organized labor and other voluntary associations who fought for their rights in different cities, women were a vital element in grass-roots reform.

Social service reforms ranging from penny lunches to social centers were advanced by clubwomen as well as by the thousands of mothers in local P.T.A.'s, which were an outgrowth of earlier mother's unions that formed in many cities by the turn of the century. Parent groups therefore became another potential source for change along with organized labor, religious leaders, and various third parties. Few parents' groups had more enthusiasm than those in Kansas City, where mothers and fathers had so much to gain and so little to lose. Kansas City's parents built the largest P.T.A. network in the world by 1920: an incredible 10,000 members.[11] Together with other grass-roots forces that had emerged in the Nineties--like Socialists, trade union leaders, Social Gospelers, and New Women--organized parents helped frame the political environment and context for Progressive change in the twentieth-century urban school. It is impossible to comprehend fully the reasons for the successes and failures of these individuals in reforming the schools without examining this larger political environment after the turn of the century. Every school innovation in the Progressive era depended greatly upon the social and political context for change that existed in the larger society.

II

During the Progressive era Toledo became famous as the city of Golden Rule Jones. Milwaukee, on the other hand, was renowned as the home of Victor Berger, the nation's first Socialist Congressman. Jones was one of the most famous reform mayors of his day, comparable to his two famous friends and counterparts, Hazen Pingree of Detroit and Tom Johnson of Cleveland. A leading peace advocate and champion of labor unions, women's rights, and Christian Socialism, Jones symbolized the social justice orientation of grass-roots Progressivism. At his death in 1904, 55,000 mourners paid their respects to the crusader for the Golden Rule. Working-class poets penned eulogies in his memory, women's groups reaffirmed their commitment to his Christian Socialist teachings, and immigrant groups marched in line to pay homage to a colorful leader. "Toledo has become notorious as the city of Sam Jones, Golden Rule Jones," wrote a Socialist who disliked him in 1905. "He died a few months ago before the expiration of his term and his name is revered by the thousands in this city."[12]

A similar outpouring of respect occurred at the funeral of a local leader in Milwaukee in 1929. In that year Victor Berger was killed by a street car, owned appropriately enough by the private transit company he had long opposed. Now remembered primarily as the nation's first Socialist congressman and the man who introduced Eugene Debs to Marx's ideas, Berger was the leading Socialist and trade union leader in Milwaukee throughout the Progressive era. A former cattle puncher and school teacher, Berger in the Nineties edited the Wisconsin Vorwarts, which was the official paper of the Socialists and the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor. Later he edited the Social Democratic Herald and the Milwaukee Leader, which were nationally syndicated Socialist newspapers. Like Jones, Berger and the Social Democrats struggled for widespread social and political reform, making educational improvements one aspect of larger grass-roots agitation. In both Toledo and Milwaukee, movements for social improvement were fashioned out of the disparate reform elements emerging out of the depression decade.[13]

Although Berger's Social Democratic Party ultimately had more far reaching and long lasting effects in municipal and educational politics, school reform continued to influence Toledo politics after the passage of the Niles Bill in 1898. The fight for school improvements was waged by Golden Rule Jones and his successor as mayor, Brand Whitlock, who assembled a loosely-knit Independent movement which controlled Toledo from 1905 to 1913. For political change in Toledo and Milwaukee was political Progressivism writ small. It was one aspect of broader political movements of men and women who either disliked or abandoned the Republican and Democratic parties. Grass-roots Progressives--workers, clubwomen, Social Gospelers, and third party dissidents--occasionally formed significant voting blocks on local school boards after the turn of the century. More typically, however, they remained an extra-institutional source of social change, pressuring school officials to implement what were perceived as desirable educational changes.

Both Jones and Whitlock effectively integrated a number of different elements into a movement for political and social change. Interaction between liberals, radicals, and utopians was the heartbeat of urban Progressivism, whose pulse throbbed from the energy released by these two leaders. Reform platforms developed through the years in Toledo, capturing popular support from the voting public. From 1897 to 1913 the Republicans and Democrats were excluded from the mayorality. Moreover, Whitlock's Independents controlled the city council for several terms, until the Republicans crushed them at the polls. Less Socialistic, flamboyent, and colorful than Jones, Whitlock nevertheless shared with his mentor support for women's rights, labor unions, and the legal rights of the poor. Through such leadership Toledo was nationally renowned as a city dedicated to human rights and social justice.[14]

Unlike Whitlock, who constructed a loosely comprised political organization, Golden Rule Jones was successively elected to office on the basis of his personal appeal and his advanced social views. He never formed a political party, and as a result conservative Republicans dominated in the city council and blocked many of his policies.[15] In 1898 Eugene Debs, a close friend, urged Jones to declare himself a member of the new Social Democratic Party. Jones responded that the Republicans and Democrats were "purely capitalistic" yet he refused to join any party.[16] His independent status throughout the remainder of his life often angered the Left as well as the Chamber of Commerce, the Pastor's Union, and most institutional voices of respectability who rejected his essentially Socialistic criticisms of society. After running as a dark horse candidate for the Republicans for mayor in 1897, Jones quickly broke with the party and ran as an independent until his death three terms later.[17]

Jones' ability to admit his mistakes in endorsing school board centralization in 1898 solidified his position within the labor movement. At the same time he also became a hero of local parent organizations and women's clubs. A number of these grassroots forces coalesced around him to agitate for political and educational reform, leading the way to the restoration of partial district representation on the school board in 1904. By the turn of the century, the reorganized, consolidated school board was best known for its ethic of business efficiency and opposition to "fads and frills" like kindergartens, playgrounds, the extended use of the schools, and other innovations collectively known as the "new education." J. Kent Hamilton, who was a prominent attorney and former mayor, dominated on the restructured board from 1898 to 1904. He opposed curricular innovations and anything associated with Golden Rule Jones. One of the sponsors of the Niles Bill, Hamilton was a regular Republican who resented Jones' bolt from the Grand Old Party.[18]

After the election results of the new school board in 1898 were tabulated, it was clear that neither women, the working classes, nor the advocates of the "new education" would find much support from the educational establishment. All five school board members were either attorneys or businessmen and were drawn from the central city business districts. As a result the outlying working-class wards, particularly the populous East Side, were excluded from representation. The new school superintendent, William W. Chalmers, opposed innovations and disliked outside interference. Moreover, women who believed that at-large elections would promote their interests watched Mary E. Law run sixth in a field of nearly forty. The small size of the board effectively denied her office. By 1901 this prominent kindergarten instructor, suffrage leader, and clubwoman attacked the reorganized school board in the Blade as "a self perpetuating machine, which takes its form largely from the dominating mind, progressive or non-progressive, honest or corrupt."[19]

Criticisms against the new school board mounted in the early 1900s. In 1902 one citizen accused the board of only representing the "seal skin districts...while those districts most largely represented in attendance at the schools were obtaining no representation." The Board of Education resembled the "Pooh Bah in the Mikado."[20] "Your board does not represent the laboring classes of the city. You are all businessmen," protested an angry labor leader. "You know you never are in touch with the poorer classes, whose children form four-fifths of the school children."[21] Both women and working people as well as entire sections of the city lacked representation on the school board. Tempers naturally flared and it became clear that some form of public redress was necessary.

With the representatives of the silk stocking districts ensconced in the school board, parent groups joined with Golden Rule Jones, the Central Labor Union, women's organizations, and even ward leaders like William Tucker to demand the reorganization of the reorganized board. A group called the Broadway Civic Club formed in 1898 and included mothers and fathers from the South Side, a working-class area. They strongly opposed at-large elections, favored district or ward representation, and called for the inauguration of the "new education." First they demanded the end of cramming, overtesting, and the use of the rod. Then they planned to destroy the "oligarchy" in the school administration, to throttle the school superintendent, and to empower teachers to select texts and school materials.[22] Another parental citizen's group was the Complete Education League, which had citywide membership. The League was the brainchild of Golden Rule Jones and his followers, who by the early twentieth century called for Progressive innovations and school social services, district representation, and working-class members on the board of education. "Let us get nearer the people through district representation," wrote the League in 1902, "and Toledo will take her stand with cities which are placing the needs of the child first."[23]

The Complete Education League was the main vehicle by which Golden Rule Jones not only fully expressed his own educational views but also united various grass-roots Progressives behind the "new education" and the second phase of school board reform. Jones' Annual Reports as well as his speeches and activities with the League gave full support to the establishment of playgrounds, kindergartens, social centers, and other innovations in the schools. Jones viewed all of these reforms as an expression of Christian service and brotherhood. He expected no praise for social service reforms since, "as I understand it, the Christian law is service for service," or another way of defining the Golden Rule.[24] The service ethic reappeared in his 1901 Annual Report to the city council, which the local press typically lambasted for its utopian qualities. "The only justification that can be offered for the right of a government to exist and to levy taxes upon the people to pay its expenses is that it makes conditions of life easier and better for the people than they could possibly be without it. Its mission then is to serve rather than to rule by force."[25]

When the school board controlled by J. Kent Hamilton refused to move as rapidly as Jones and the Progressives desired, citizens quickly learned that "non-partisan" school administrations were actually espousing particular political interests. Jones helped form the Toledo Playground Association in 1899, which collected private donations for the establishment of the first public playgrounds in Toledo. The success of the playground movement caused the organization to change its name in 1900 to the Complete Education League which, it was argued, reflected "the new education movement" and the "progressive spirit" of the city. The new title indicated the organization's desire to "broaden the meaning of public education" to include play, recreation, relaxed learning environments, closer parent-teacher relations, and a more pleasant and harmonious environment for the child.[26] By 1902 a contributor to Complete Education contended that education meant growth and required constant experimentation. The school board, unfortunately, brazenly defied this principle, "as if fully realizing that they are removed away from the reach of the people; that they are responsible to nobody; that they are safe in their position; and so they keep on in their detrimental policy."[27]

In attacking the elite nature of the school board and in broadening their plans for social reform, Jones and his followers solidified their alliances with labor and especially with women. Many suffrage leaders like Rosa Segur, one of the oldest feminists in the city, were active in women's clubs and parent's organizations like the Broadway Civic Club, which visited schools, published critical reports in the local newspapers, and became consumer-like watchdogs on educational policy.[28] Jones had not supported women's suffrage throughout his life but was a recent convert to the cause, part of his larger transformation during the depression from conservative businessman to urban radical. His discovery of the principle of the Golden Rule as a cure for human misery led him to embrace the concept of human equality and brotherhood. An acceptance of the notion of the fatherhood of God led him to espouse the brotherhood of man and, as he said on one occasion, it was blasphemous to think that your father was better than your mother! As he told a correspondent in 1898, "(W)omen are people, and, in my opinion, their inferiority (?), real or imaginary, is due wholly to their economic dependence upon man; it is an artificial condition that will disappear with the better civilization that is coming."[29]

Many Toledoans found it difficult to dislike a man who could claim, "I believe in Brotherhood, and my belief in it includes every human being on the face of the earth--the scalawag, the president, the harlot, the social leader of the four hundred, the puny baby, and brutalized plub ugly; they are all a part of me and I am part of them."[30] Jones wrote such statements with such an utter lack of pretentiousness and genuine sincerity that many parents, women, and workers were attracted to the simplicity and beauty of his arguments. Rosa Segur, Pauline Steinem, Mary Law, and Kate B. Sherwood--all suffrage activists, advocates of labor unions, parent teacher associations, and now district representation on the school board--joined the Golden Rule mayor as he marched in numerous labor day parades, listened to guest lecturers on progressive subjects at the Golden Rule Settlement House, and continually imbibed the ideas of Social Christianity.[31]

Pauline Steinem, who was the president of the Council of Jewish Women and a leading force in the City Federation of Women, pushed the latter organization until it formally adopted the principles of Complete Education in 1900. By the turn of the century she was characteristically speaking across the city on the virtues of the "new education" before groups like the Golden Rule Mothers' Club, which met at Golden Rule Hall. Elected to the school board between 1905 and 1909 on a Progressive platform, she was the President of the Ohio Woman's Suffrage Association and advocated the local Independent movement, parental organizations, and many political causes.[32] Kate Sherwood, whose husband was the perennial choice of the Central Labor Union to Congress, where he served for many years, was herself a Christian Socialist and a supporter of Jones and school innovations. Under the leadership of Rosa Segur, the Broadway Civic Club also endorsed Jones' candidacies for mayor. None of these women were ever able to cast a ballot for Samuel M. Jones, but together with the Complete Education League, the Central Labor Union, ward leaders, and other agitators they successfully restored some district representation to the school board in 1904.[33] During that year the entire Hamilton school board was convincingly voted out of office.

Emerging as a prominent political leader out of the depths of the economic depression, Jones probably filled multiple voids in the lives of many Toledoans all the while that he made educational reform part of his larger designs for social and political reconstruction. Jones actively endorsed the initiative, the referendum, the recall, and the direct election of Senators, urged popular referendums to replace the mayor's veto powers, and took guns away from the police. While personally a teetotaler, he refused to advance temperance policies despite the continual claim that Toledo was a "wide open" town.[34] Jones and many citizens believed that alcohol was "poison," yet he represented the interests of many workers and immigrants who enjoyed their Sunday beer and favored democratic legislation. For suffrage-oriented women, Jones represented hope for political and social equality not generally advanced so strongly in its time. But the question remains how this Welsh immigrant with his stocky build, sandy hair, and freckled complexion captured the enthusiasm of voters for over seven years, building the basis for a third party movement that would continue his policies until 1913.

Part of Jones' popularity certainly stems from the fact that he promoted women's rights and labor organizations at a time when business was consolidating its control of the market place and denying these groups any influence in the shaping of public policy. By supporting the second reorganization of the school board, for example, he tried to rectify perceived injustices of several groups--parents, workers, and women--all of whom were ill served by his earlier support for the Niles Bill. More than that, however, Jones merged all the right issues with a deeply religious and moral appeal for a more just social order, a change in human values away from material accumulation by the few at the expense of the many. The Pastors' Union constantly attacked him and continually wondered why many workers had left the church. What formal religion failed to provide for troubled citizens was perhaps compensated for by their deeply religious mayor, who never went to church.[35] He provided the comfort, solace, and hope for a better day that was absent in the typical Sunday sermon that still assumed that poverty had personal rather than social roots.

Brand Whitlock, Jones' close friend and successor as mayor, once wrote that the support for the Golden Rule resulted from the fact that the working classes had abandoned the churches but not religion. "The great mass of the people, the poor people, do not go to church," Whitlock once observed, "they have no interest in the church and very little respect for it, and yet I have discovered...among the working people [that] nothing so quickly interests them as the real gospel of Jesus, i. e., the ethics, the morals of Jesus."[36] Jones regularly referred to his office as a "pulpit" from which he could proclaim "progressive and radical utterances."[37] The Evening Bee in 1903 described a typical Jones rally at Golden Rule Hall: "The crowd sang Jones' songs under the leadership of the mayor, until the meeting resembled a Methodist revival."[38] Such descriptions along with Jones' nickname help confirm Whitlock's belief that "his meetings were not political meetings as they were religious meetings, and he was not so much a campaigner as an evangelist--not so much politician as prophet."[39] There was Jones, speaking from open carriages or at open tent meetings, shouting the Gospel of the Golden Rule. Or there he was on the street corner, pleading for an end to capitalism, with his son Paul playing his saxaphone in the background to help attract the inevitable crowds.

Jones' death deprived the city of the most colorful mayors in its history. Progressive politics, however, continued under Brand Whitlock. Greatly influenced by the politics of Illinois Governor John Peter Altgeld, Whitlock drafted the famous pardon that freed the Haymarket Square bombers. He settled in Toledo at the turn of the century, where he formed a close bond with Golden Rule Jones and was locally called "the poor man's lawyer." He opposed capital punishment, continued Jones' policy of replacing policemen's weapons with light canes, and favored Continental Sundays, women's suffrage, trade unions, home rule, and numerous democratic voting devices. On numerous issues he stood on the side of labor unions, women's organizations, and parent groups. Whitlock championed the "new education," refused to invoke injunctions against labor during prolonged strikes, and along with clubwomen rallied to the side of striking laundry workers in 1907. Through his aid these working women reached an amicable settlement, giving him widespread support from suffrage leaders, women's organizations, and labor during his several terms as mayor.

Under Whitlock's tenure in office between 1905 and 1913, Progressive school reform remained only one phase of larger municipal reform. There were prolonged fights against boodlers in public office, struggles for cheap transit fares for consumers, as well as many efforts at school improvement. With aid from women's groups, Whitlock helped agitate for Ohio's Juvenile Court law and sought enabling legislation to permit the use of municipal funds for social centers, penny lunches, and other innovations that were encouraged by women and progressive trade unions. After coauthoring the home rule section of the Ohio Construction in 1912, he considered his job completed and refused to run for reelection. He became a national hero for his role in evacuating refugees from Belgium during World War I and spent the remainder of his life fulfilling his ambitions as a journalist and writer. The circumstances surrounding the collapse of the Independent movement and the return of Republican rule in 1913 is immaterial here, but Whitlock's departure from Toledo culminated over a decade of third party rule in the city of the Golden Rule.[40]

III

While Toledo was nationally recognized for sixteen years of political independency under Jones and Whitlock, Milwaukee was even more widely renowned as a hotbed of third party dissent. Political crankism had grown to maturity. For although trade unionism and Socialism were integral features of grass-roots reform in Toledo, few cities could match the political successes of the Socialist Party and the labor movement in the Wisconsin metropolis. The Social Democratic Party, firmly allied with the Federated Trades Council by the turn of the century, became one of the most visible expressions of working-class protest against Republicans and Democrats in the nation. While Jones became a popular leader in Toledo in a very short period of time, the Social Democrats perfected a well oiled political machine in Milwaukee which more gradually gained influence in the city council, the school board, and the state legislature. An article on the "rising tide of Socialism" in the Journal of Political Economy in 1911 followed the trend in national magazines and called Milwaukee the key municipality in the Socialist movement.[41]

Milwaukee is an exceptional city, with a Socialist reputation that matches the fame of its beer. It nevertheless provides another instructive yet unique example of social change on the grass roots. Here as in Toledo school reform was only one aspect of larger social justice campaigns and was produced by the regular interaction of women's clubs, parent groups, working-class organizations, and Socialists. Compared to Rochester and Kansas City and even Toledo, however, Milwaukee possessed the most successful third party movement, one which was firmly based on thousands of Socialist trade union members. While Golden Rule Jones failed to organize any political party and Whitlock's Independents never congealed into a party per se, Victor Berger and the Social Democrats carefully built a formal, stable, and growing political network to oppose the rule of the established parties.

During the Progressive era Milwaukee had one of the nation's strongest and most politically astute labor movements. The Federated Trades Council grew to approximately 35,000 members in 1920. In 1910, the Social Democratic Party (S.D.P.), the political wing of the Federated Trades Council (F.T.C.), won nationally-acclaimed victories at the polls by electing a mayor and a majority of the members of the city council and the board of county supervisors.[42] The first Socialist sweep in a large American city, it nurtured a state of rising expectations in thousands of American Socialists. While Toledo's Independent movement was moribund by 1913, Milwaukee's Socialist tradition endured throughout the first half of this century, both in the schools, where the S.D.P. comprised a significant voting block, and in city government in general. When Meta Berger, the wife of the Socialist editor and Congressman, became President of the school board in 1915, she was not only the first Socialist in the nation to achieve this distinction, but she also symbolized the growing recognition of labor's political power.[43]

The rise of Socialist and trade union leadership in Milwaukee was not an accident of history but the product of years of concerted effort. The Socialist working class grew by accretion, increased its ideological sophistication over time, and ultimately represented diverse, shifting elements of working people. From their dismal entry into municipal politics in 1898 to their landslide victories over a decade later, the Social Democrats increased their voting strength each election year. Increasingly the non-socialist unions within the F.T.C. were silenced, the trade unions broadened their loyalty and financial support to the party, additional services and programs (which would appeal to other social classes) were added to the party platform, and a variety of new immigrant groups became attracted to Socialism. A Socialist movement was in the making. When nine Social Democrats were elected to the city council in 1904, the Milwaukee Sentinel aptly noted that "a new element has come upon the field to assertively dispute the right of the democrats and republicans to dominate the politics of the city of Milwaukee."[44]

Contemporaries continually commented on the trade union foundation of Milwaukee Socialism. One reason for the success of the local Socialist party, claimed a partisan in the International Socialist Review in 1904, "is its proletarian character. The members of the organization are workingmen almost to a man, and there is no large city in the United States where the Socialist movement is so overwhelmingly trades unionist."[45] David Rose, who was a formidable Democratic opponent during his term as mayor, typically complained that the S.D.P. was forever "pratting on about the rights of labor, always appealing for the down-trodden laboring man."[46] Similarly, the party chieftain, Victor Berger, made the familiar statement that "working-men, organized and unorganized, constitute the overwhelming bulk--more than 95 percent--of the [local] Socialist party."[47] Little wonder, then, that he proclaimed on many occasions that "non-partisan" workingmen were traitors to their class and that the Socialists were the "partisans of the proletariat."

The evolution of an explicitly Socialist and working-class third party movement that gained solid footholds in politics and the schools contrasts sharply with urban developments elsewhere. Socialists formed the majority within the Federated Trades Council by the turn of the century and remained dominant for several decades. This situation was not replicated either in Toledo, Rochester, or Kansas City. All of these cities had their share of pro-Socialist unions, but the majority of urban trade unions never aligned with a political party or an identifiable movement, especially a Socialist one. Even in Toledo, where the Central Labor Union backed Golden Rule Jones and formally endorsed many of the principles and programs of Whitlock's Independents, organized labor essentially remained apolitical. Local unions backed individuals for office and passed numerous resolutions on sundry issues. They nevertheless refused to back any particular political party and never established their own workingman's ticket. As one historian has written, the Central Labor Union's startling referendum of 1908 that backed the state Socialist ticket was not only a surprise to contemporaries but an aberration in their long history.[48]

Compared to other cities, the creation of a long-term, successful, and explicitly Socialist third party in Wisconsin's leading city was an unusual political development. Golden Rule Jones was undeniably a Christian Socialist, and he readily acknowledged that the two party system buttressed capitalism. But Jones hated the very idea of political parties, preferred the use of direct nominations by the people, and thereby incurred the wrath of the local Socialist Labor Party and the Social Democrats.[49] Jones used the word socialism in many ways, often equating it with Social Justice, Social Democracy, and Brotherhood. As he argued in the Social Gospel in 1901, "I am a Socialist. I believe in Brotherhood and can only find peace in advocating those principles that will lead men to live more brotherly."[50] The voters of Toledo were satisfied with his explanations even if regular Republicans and Democrats rejected them. While very similar to Socialist parties in the programs they endorsed and in their social views, neither Jones nor Whitlock joined the Socialist Party, opting instead for the principle of political independence.[51]

This does not mean that the Milwaukee Socialists were political purists who only accepted the support of true believers. Victor and Meta Berger, Emil Seidel, Daniel Hoan, and the many men and women in the movement were non-doctrinaire though commited to the establishment of a Socialist state. As Roderick Nash has argued, they tried to Americanize Marx by adapting his views to a non-European environment.[52] Living in a city with immigrants and Catholics, liberal women's organizations, and a strong German trade union tradition, they tried peacefully to build a broad based, multi-ethnic organization that would appeal to men and women of all economic classes. In 1901 the F.T.C. unanimously adopted the following resolution, which testified to its willingness to cooperate in the cause of reform and still retain a vision of the "cooperative commonwealth": "Resolved, That we call upon all righteous and liberty-loving citizens to unite with us at the ballot-box in order that we may abolish the present system of exploitation and establish a new and higher order of civilization, where poverty, misery, and prostitution, and all the crime and insanity emanating therefrom shall be unknown."[53]

This emphasis on gradual, peaceful social action by all "righteous and liberty-loving citizens" in the name of Socialism was an important factor in the emerging strength of the Social Democrats. They slowly built up their membership rolls, borrowed already popular ideas from non-Socialists when they seemed beneficial to workers, and discovered that in their ability to work with others lay the key to power and reform. The Social-Democratic Herald summed up the position in 1901 when it favored "a policy of steady, socialistic reforms" over violent revolution, though party leaders sometimes proclaimed that bullets might replace ballots if peaceful social activism failed.[54] The Socialists carefully carved their own ideological niche in city and national politics. They distinguished themselves from "reformers" they often had to cooperate with, but who saw reforms as ends in themselves; and they also separated themselves from nationally prominent Socialists further to the Left as well as members of the I.W.W. who favored revolutionary struggle over political participation.

By attempting to build a non-violent reform coalition that hopefully went beyond liberalism, the Milwaukee Socialists were attacked from the Left as well as from the ruling business elite. They occupied the somewhat uncomfortable position of popularizing programs that originated among non-socialist groups. Long-time Socialist leader Emil Seidel, a wood carver and former mayor, recalled in the 1930s that "some eastern smarties called ours a Sewer Socialism. Yes, we wanted sewers in the workers' homes; but we wanted much, oh,--so very much more than sewers. We wanted our workers to have pure air; we wanted them to have sunshine," and "living wages," "recreation," and "a chance for every human being to be strong and live a life of happiness."[55] Milwaukee's Socialists admittedly worked with liberals for immediate "reforms." Still, only the Socialists never forgot that "no mere reform can solve the social problems; that nothing can save them or us in the end but a complete transformation of our economic system and its method of production and distribution of wealth." Until then, however, "all possible advantages for the toilers are gained" through reform, which hopefully helped implant the "final goal and the noble ideal of Socialism...permanently in the minds of the workers."[56]

Certainly the Milwaukee Socialists have often been severely criticized by historians just as they were by so many contemporaries: they seem to have pleased no one. Like many of his white working-class followers, Victor Berger often demonstrated a Neanderthal approach to race relations. He gradually tempered his racism as his views changed slightly in the 1920s, when he spoke out in favor of a federal anti-lynching policy. More typically, the Milwaukeeans are routinely condemned as overly middle-class and reformist in orientation: too interested in the daily problems of workers and not sufficiently interested in promoting actual revolution. Without underestimating the strength of racist views in many working-class movements in the twentieth century, one should not ignore the fact that the Milwaukeeans, despite obvious inconsistencies, did link their demands for social change with working-class struggle. As David Montgomery notes, historians who divide turn-of-the-century working-class activists into reformist and revolutionary camps obscure rather than illuminate "the ideology of the workers." Very often Socialists and skilled workers in particular "linked union struggles over job conditions to community reforms of desperate importance to workers. Nothing could be more misleading than to identify "sewer socialism" with bourgeois influence upon the party. The bourgeoisie, and only they, already had good sewers."[57] Historian James Green concurs with this evaluation, noting that so-called movements for gas and water socialism, so easily dismissed today, were often working-class efforts to challenge the designs of business and capitalist oriented Progressive reformers.[58]

From 1898 onward, the Milwaukee Socialist party platform contained more and more social welfare and educational programs, drawing upon the work of voluntary associations and women's groups in the Nineties. Education became one of the key issues in working-class struggle. Party leaders emphasized constructive social action, chastized doctrinal thinking, and urged all Socialists to "continually develop, learn, and study" while advancing the immediate interests of the workers. While sensitive to the charge that they were "sewer socialists," organized labor increasingly became more dedicated to educational reform in the name of proletarian struggle, more vocal in school affairs, and more likely to flex its enlarged political muscle. By 1905, the Social-Democratic Herald sensed that the working-class had finally begun to strengthen its forces on all fronts. "The working class have a big stake in the public schools," wrote a local commentator, "and [they] are sufficiently awakening in Milwaukee to see from now on that the educational system is not abused and misdirected."[59]

Indeed, nowhere was the working-class nature of the movement better revealed than in the party's views on education. The S.D.P.

and F.T.C. did not have any direct power over school reform until 1909, when they joined to elect representatives to the school board. Yet their concern with improved education for working-class children was recognized even by their most severe critics. Educational reforms comprised an integral part of their party movement and effort to build a Socialist state. Initial demands for free textbooks and easy access to school halls in the Nineties blossomed into much broader programs for school social services. Long, glowing statements on the power of education to cultivate working-class intellect and to nurture Socialist perspectives permeated the writings of prominent trade unionists and party leaders. Like Socialists elsewhere, the Milwaukeeans conducted Socialist Sunday Schools that explicitly tried to educate working-class children on the need for a new social order. Still, they primarily focused their attention on the public schools. Through their mass character and compulsory features, the schools were seen as a prime way to help promote Socialism once the proletariat seized control over them.

The Social-Democratic Herald and the Milwaukee Leader, which were the official newspapers of the Socialists, continually focused on the fortunes of education in the city. Editorial after editorial and resolution after resolution highlighted the centrality of education in working-class struggle. The Socialists were the "staunchist friends" of the public schools, "in fair weather and foul"; the schools were "the key with which the masses may unlock the storehouses of the world's accumulated knowledge"; hence the Social Democrats "stand for the public schools and the widest extension of their facilities, that every child may have the opportunity to get an education."[60] In 1917 the Milwaukee Leader asserted that no class benefitted as much from collective activities like health programs or public education as "the proletariat. It is the only place...the working class exercises any real political function and from which it gets any benefits worth while."[61]

Socialists fought for decades for liberal reforms in school and society, making educational innovation a branch of their political movement just as the Independents had done in Toledo for over a decade. Yet if the Socialists were willing to cooperate with liberals, they were not prepared to fuse with them. Poverty, they realized, could not be eradicated through social services, only through a redistribution of national wealth. Over and over again, the Socialists made this point clear, as in this typical editorial in the Milwaukee Leader in 1913:

> Reformers are willing to amuse the poor, to educate the poor (on some things), to do almost anything imaginable except to stop the causes of poverty. Socialists are willing to accept all these alleviations. They want good schools and social centers, and public parks, and pensions and unemployment relief and everything that can be devised to make more tolerable the condition of the workers while poverty remains.[62]

At the same time, however, "none of these things, nor all of these things added together is sufficient, nor fundamental to the Socialist."

By the early 1900s Milwaukee's Socialist movement was not only surviving but flourishing, gradually building into a force for political and educational change. The Socialists already had representatives on the city council and in the state legislature, a weekly newspaper to disseminate their ideas, and a splendid political organization. The infamous "Bundle Brigade," which could distribute thousands of party leaflets in several languages within a few hours, greeted workers at the factory gate at every municipal election. Socialist cells flourished across the city, tightly bound into the central body of its democratically-elected ruling elite. By 1905 an industrialist and political analyst accurately predicted that the Republican and Democratic parties would soon field a single ticket to stem the growth of Socialism, just as the major parties had launched a "Citizen's Ticket" to repel the Socialists and the Union Labor Party in 1888.[63]

Near the middle of the first decade of the new century, the Socialists expanded their appeal beyond skilled laborers in the

F.T.C. They spread their ideas to new segments of the working class and to the leaders of several voluntary groups. This process of expansion and interaction constituted the most exciting episode in the making of Milwaukee Socialism; a third party movement thereby emerged as a viable force in Milwaukee's political life, causing a breakdown of the traditional two party system. Perhaps the most memorable and significant part of this historical process was the attraction of substantial numbers of Poles to the Socialist cause. Milwaukee Socialism has always been associated, of course, with the predominately German trade unions.[64] By the turn of the century, however, the Germans were losing their historical predominance in the city's cultural and political life. The rising Polish population, largely unskilled working-class families who lived in the southern, industrial section of town, was replacing the Germans as the major ethnic group.

The trade unions had not forgotten that Poles were used as strikebreakers in Milwaukee as early as the 1870s. Prejudice against these new immigrants seemed to hinder any coalition of workers. When the Polish Educational Society petitioned for the introduction of Polish into the public schools in the 1890s, the F.T.C. failed to endorse the plan before the school board, and Polish language classes only began when the Social Democrats and settlement workers on the school board championed this innovation over a decade later. Then individuals who were isolated from each other joined together in supporting this reform as German and Pole put their differences aside, at least temporarily, for mutual protection and welfare.[65]

The movement from isolation to cooperation, to a belief that strength existed in numbers, was a difficult one. The Roman Catholic Church, historically a powerful opponent of Socialism, was central to the lives of many Poles in the city. The Church's influence among the Polish working-class was partially overcome by the Socialists only with the greatest difficulty. The amazing thing is that the Social Democrats made any headway in the Catholic neighborhoods of Milwaukee, for the Catholic establishment vigorously denounced them. Parochial school groups lobbied continually against the introduction of Polish in the public schools, since they feared that it might undermine the attractiveness of their own institutions. As late as 1915, they helped defeat Social Democratic resolutions in the state legislature for free textbooks and meals for children.[66] Moreover, the Socialists and the public schools were regularly condemned in the Sunday pulpit. The public schools helped breed Socialism, vice, and crime; they "have produced nothing but a Godless generation of thieves and blackguards," which was not surprising since the Social Democrats who sent their children there were "atheists," "beasts," "hell's lowest vomit," and "free lovers,"[67]

The Socialists responded that they were good family men, temperate in eating and drinking, and enthusiastically supportive of reforms that would protect the nuclear family now being undermined by capitalism. The Catholic hierarchy remained sceptical. Archbishop Sebastian Mesmer, a life-long foe of Socialism, denied the sacraments, church burial, and other Catholic benefits to those who joined the Social Democratic Party. It is surprising, therefore, that so many Poles transcended their religious identities and risked their souls for a glimpse of a new social order. And significant inroads into Milwaukee's _Polonia_ were indeed achieved by the Socialists. When the Social Democrats swept into office in 1910, they convincingly triumphed in the city's famous fourteenth ward, which was predominantly Catholic and Polish working class, and they won pluralities in other Polish districts. Donald Pienkos has demonstrated that Polish Social Democrats represented the city in the state legislature and, to highlight the long-term effects of Socialism, seven of the twenty-one Poles elected to the city council between 1910 and 1940 were Socialists.[68]

Diligent effort and mutual benefit sealed this unlikely alliance of German trade unionists and the Polish working-class. The Polish Educational Society, defeated in its lone bid before the board of education in the Nineties, reorganized after the turn of the century as the Polish School Society. Convinced that the masses suffered under the yoke of the clergy, the Society was intensely anti-clerical and devoted to secular education; moreover, its members shared the cause of class struggle and school reform already promoted by the Socialists. The Society was led by a Polish brewery worker, Martin Gorecki, who was elected as Socialist alderman-at-large in 1910 and later became state assemblyman.[69] The F.T.C., aware of this split within the Polish community, launched a full-fledged effort to recruit more Poles to the party in 1907 to expand its power base, so the rise of Polish Socialism was the product of prolonged effort. The Socialists began to publish a Polish Socialist newspaper and to infiltrate the South Side with pamphleteers and speakers who were careful never to insult workingmen who were still church members. These efforts obviously produced results on election day, despite all the dire warnings of local priests and the archbishop. And, by 1912, a few thousand Polish children received bilingual training in the public schools, where they read books provided free by the Polish School Society.[70]

If the alliance of Poles and Germans was a somewhat surprising occurrence in the new century, the increased interaction of the Socialists and the Milwaukee women's clubs was a similarly unexpected yet important political development. Yet, if atheists could work with once devout Catholics, surely mechanics could work with those who were maligned as "petticoated politicians"! The Socialists, of course, repeatedly emphasized their differences with non-socialists who were "merely" reformers. Still, both the women and the workers had tangible effects on each other's political development and reform strategies. The Socialists, for example, sensed the popularity of many of the social welfare programs already financed or suggested by these voluntary associations--the playgrounds, vacation schools, lunch programs, and social centers. The enlargement of the social functions of the public schools became the common goal uniting these two dissimilar groups in the cause of reform.

Civic associations like women's groups never endorsed the revolutionary rhetoric and aims of the Socialist working class. These groups never embraced Socialism, yet they played an indispensable part in the rise and distinctive shape of Milwaukee politics. These civic groups, wrote a leading Social Democrat, "much prefer advancing the common good to being mere rubber stamps of big business." And, he added, they "have not only been an important force for the good, but often have provided the balance of power necessary to compel recalcitrant officials to stand on the side of civic decency and progress."[71] The increased cooperation of Socialist and non-Socialist groups for reform was not foreordained in the Nineties but, like so many people in history, both soon learned that for better or worse they needed each other's support. The civic associations left their own imprint on the Socialist working class, just as they in turn radicalized many individual clubwomen who ultimately embraced Socialism. The histories of the Socialist working class and these civic groups became closely intertwined.

The transit of ideas and influence between these groups did not follow a single path. Socialists adopted some of the social service programs of the women and incorporated them into their political platforms. The ideas of prominent clubwomen in turn were reshaped by the Social Democratic fervor that infected Milwaukee, just as the women in Toledo had been altered by the Golden Rule. Had they lived in a city without a Socialist working-class tradition, some Milwaukee women might never have shifted from a non-Socialist reform camp to a more radical perspective. The experience of living in a place where laborers became more powerful through political organization served as a catalyst for more systematic analysis of social issues and the problems--and causes--of poverty. In the 1890s many clubwomen undoubtedly believed that poverty was a temporary condition to be overcome through charity and benevolence. A decade later, important voluntary association members like those of the Woman's School Alliance questioned this position.

By 1907 a prominent member of the W.S.A. proclaimed that school meals were a human right for all children, not a charity to be dispensed selectively to the children of the poor. The Social Democrats had already argued this position for a few years. Mrs. C. B. Whitnall, one of the earliest W.S.A. members, publicly announced her conversion to the Social Democratic Party in 1908, shortly after her appointment to the school board as a non-socialist reformer. Moreover, Meta Berger, a Socialist school board member from 1909 to 1939, formed close ties and warm friendships with settlement workers and liberal reformers in voluntary groups, ensuring a reliable voice for the expansion of social services and school innovations. During her three decades in office, Berger was often simultaneously an Alliance official, highlighting the compatibility of Socialism and service group participation.[72] Hence the Social Democrats both reacted to as well as shaped the dominant reform coalitions that evolved in Milwaukee.

The growing cooperation and interaction between previously isolated groups in the interests of social reform were most evident in the movement for the direct election of the school board and the school bond crisis of 1909. Golden Rule Jones helped drive women to support district representation in Toledo in 1904, and the public esteem and respectability of the Milwaukee Socialists also climbed dramatically because of their position on similar issues, paving the way for later electoral successes. Socialists would have preferred only working with other Socialists, of course, and the Milwaukeeans were often attacked from their left nationally for being opportunists. In spite of this, the Milwaukeeans eschewed political and ideological consistency and fought for the immediate welfare of the city's school children. Reformers--both Socialist and non-Socialist, clubwoman and worker, German and Pole--practiced the art of cooperation.

Concerning the type of school board needed in Milwaukee, the Socialists put it bluntly in 1907: "Shall we have a Merchants and Manufacturers' Association school board or a people's school board?"[73] Even though they vacillated on whether they wanted a school board elected at large or by wards, the Social Democrats called for direct elections over the commission and appointment plan engineered by the Goo-Goos in 1897. Many non-Socialists rallied to the Socialist side. The Social-Democratic Herald proclaimed:

> We do not mean to say that if the old system of appointment of members of the board was in vogue that the board would be any less a nest of politicians and embryo politicians, but we do say that the present system is no improvement over the old and that besides it is in this sense worse. Because the directors get their appointment at the hands of a commission appointed by the mayor and it becomes a part of the old party spoils system.[74]

Whether the Socialists would have complained if their own members had been named to the school board by either ward aldermen or commission members is of course unknown. Throughout the early 1900s, however, men like David Rose, the chief enemy of the Socialists and the partisan of thousands of Catholics, appointed the members of the commission as mayor and thereby shaped board membership. In opposing the direct election of the school board, in defiance of the Socialists and then most civic groups in Milwaukee, Rose unwittingly drove these individuals together and helped topple his regime from power in 1910.

Not all of the appointees to the school board were unqualified foes of Socialism or outspoken champions of parochial schooling like David Rose. But there were enough of them. Besides appointing a large number of Catholics to one particular board, Rose appointed some of the leading anti-union representatives of big business. For example, Thomas J. Neacy, a major industrialist in the metal trades and a leader in the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, used his influence on the board after the turn of the century to seek parsimony in school expenses in the name of business efficiency. The Social Democrats and the new Milwaukee Teachers Association, which sought higher salaries for teachers, condemned him as one of the largest tax dodgers in the city. Moreover, the F.T.C. unanimously denounced Neacy and his industrial cohorts in 1905 when they established a privately endowed trade school, which the Socialists simply labelled a "school for strike breakers." The Vorwarts summed up the feelings of the trade unions when it stated that, "Frankly, the 'people' have no respect for the workings of the Rose regime, any more than they have for a 'boodler and a pimp'."[75]

Not all of the members of the board were as intolerable as Neacy. Victor Berger and other Socialists agreed that settlement workers and other liberals on it at least sympathized with the problems of the poor and advocated more school programs and social services. Still, it was obvious that the only way in which the Socialist working class could gain representation in the schools was through direct elections--the same way they were already placing members on the city council and in the state legislature. After the turn of the century, therefore, the F.T.C. presented bills in Madison for the at-large election of the school board, with little success. After subsequently learning that the ward was their best geographical base of power, they increasingly backed a ward-based, elected board, "so that no matter what political party has the upper hand in the city it cannot have complete control of the school board with no vestige of minority representation. That's the issue!"[76]

In some ways, ideological consistency would have been preserved if the Social Democrats simply argued that the method of electing school boards was only one aspect of larger proletarian struggle. That would have nevertheless isolated them from numerous non-socialists in Milwaukee who agreed on the need for reform, and thereby weakened their chances to assume additional political power. As was increasingly clear in the shaping of Milwaukee Socialism, the working class had to cooperate with other reform-minded people to realize its leadership potential. This was expecially demonstrated when the Socialists led the effort to create an elective school board after the turn of the century. Neither the ward leaders of the Nineties nor later advocates of the commission plan generally endorsed the direct election of the board of education. The behavior of the Rose dominated boards nevertheless angered Milwaukeeans of many different classes and social positions. Many voluntary associations--the W.S.A., the Social Economics Club, as well as large groups of teachers and principals--vigorously opposed a proposal for direct election offered to the legislature in 1901.[77] Yet almost every such visible group favored the elimination of the commission plan by 1909. Again, in a few short years, Socialists and non-Socialists had found themselves jointly championing reform.

Popular dissatisfaction with the appointment plan was obvious by 1907, when the Social Democrats and these voluntary associations urged the direct election of the school board. Even the Republican and conservative Sentinel, which had enthusiastically supported the commission plan in the 1890s and had traditionally opposed direct election schemes, reversed its stand after a series of polls with its readers overwhelmingly supported reform. Certainly the context of city politics early in the century helps explain why isolated groups united on this issue. During these years dozens of city officials were indicted for graft and corruption, with many actually convicted of boodling. This legitimized Socialist attacks on the major parties. Moreover, the miserly allocation of school funds by these officials helped make the prospects of direct elections gradually more appealing over time. No school officials were indicted, for the abuse of power rested in the city council, which controlled the school's funds. For years no schools were constructed, as the mayor and his associates diverted funds initially earmarked for the schools to other pet projects and to their own pockets, leading to increased overcrowding and citizen complaint.[78]

The Social Democrats correctly sensed that the idea of the direct election of the school board had popular support in Milwaukee. This was another example of the political "opportunism" of the Wisconsin Socialists that infuriated more radical comrades. Locally, the issue of taxation with representation and in particular minority representation (of women and laborers), the fear of a possible slowdown in the inauguration and progress of school service programs, and the whole issue of whether the people could be trusted with representative democracy was hotly debated throughout the city. Individuals who disagreed on other public issues seemed for their own various reasons to prefer direct election over the commission plan. As the Socialists realized, many people opposed the commission plan, favored direct election, and hated the S.D.P. One could easily hate corruption and tax-dodging without accepting a single tenet of Marx's principles. The Socialists, however, successfully channelled all of this discontent into a constructive struggle that led to one of labor's immediate demands: direct election. By opposing graft and promising honest government, the Social Democrats again widened their electoral base. David Rose, nicknamed Dave Roach and labelled the "degenerate mayor" by labor for his reactionary school policies, used his influence in the council to block direct elections until 1909, but even he could not repel the reform coalitions that had assembled by the end of the decade.[79]

In addition to the direct election struggle, the key issue that then catalyzed a broadly based movement for reform was the city administration's slashing of school bonds. Besides opposing the direct election plan, the city council moved at a snail's pace in providing the schools with adequate funds. Because everyone except Mayor Rose acknowledged that the schools were grossly overcrowded, school bond referenda passed with comfortable margins throughout the Progressive era.[80] In 1908, voters routinely approved a bond worth $360,000 for new school buildings, receiving at the time the largest plurality in Milwaukee's history. Rose illegally slashed the appropriation to $120,000. The Social Democrats as well as the Federation of Civic Societies, which was comprised of prominent voluntary associations, immediately organized indignation meetings across Milwaukee. Nearly 2,000 people attended some sessions. A School Defense Committee was formed, petitions drafted for the city council, and newspapers of various political persuasions condemned Rose for his actions. After well publicized and lengthy court battles, this alliance of Socialists and non-Socialists finally salvaged $245,000 of the original appropriation.[81]

It had been an unintended alliance, born of the circumstances of Milwaukee's political life. The clubwomen and dissident Poles emerging in the Nineties seemed like the most unlikely people to seek common cause with the Socialist working class. But it had occurred all the same. Out of the unexpected twists and turns of urban politics, out of the growing realization that it was better to cooperate than to work at cross purposes, there emerged a broad based political movement whose influence would peak in the next decade. Between 1897 and 1909, a third party movement arose which now threatened to transform city politics and the public schools.

In both Toledo and Milwaukee, educational change occurred in the context of the larger social and political developments that emerged out of the depression and continued to shape urban life in the new century. Jones, Whitlock, and the Independents fought for district representation, a larger role for women, and a school system that provided expanded social services and programs. Victor Berger and the Social Democrats in Milwaukee built a more durable political base and became the force to which the grass roots increasingly looked for political leadership. Voluntary associations and third party activists remained viable if not always dominant forces for political and educational change in the Progressive era. Even in Rochester and Kansas City, where third parties never seriously threatened the two party system, school reform reflected the shape of the larger political environment and was the product of the interaction between many competing forces.

IV

The contours of the age of reform in Rochester and Kansas City were strikingly different from Toledo and Milwaukee. Under Golden Rule Jones and the Independents of Brank Whitlock, Toledo witnessed over a decade of successful political revolt outside of the Republican and Democratic parties that included new directions in educational thought and school reform. An even stronger, more radical, and more working-class movement for Socialism raged in Milwaukee during the Progressive era, as the Social Democratic Party and the Federated Trades Council also challenged the supremacy of the two party system. The major elements of third party revolt were present in varying degrees in Rochester and Kansas City. What was missing, however, was a sustained movement on the left or by liberals who could control municipal politics for any notable period of time. Republicans and Democrats remained the dominant political parties in Rochester and Kansas City at the very time that politicians elsewhere like Golden Rule Jones, Brand Whitlock, Mary Law, and Rosa Segur in Toledo, and Victor and Meta Berger, Emil Seidel, and Lizzie Black Kander in Milwaukee dissented from the established parties and actively shaped city politics and the schools.

That is not to say that significant changes in the curriculum and social services in the schools did not occur in either Rochester or Kansas City. On the contrary, various grass-roots organizations interacted with the political system and forced many new ideas upon the school system. Labor groups, Socialists, women's groups, and other voluntary associations continued to agitate for change as they did in many other cities after the turn of the century. Yet the movements for reform in Rochester and Kansas City lacked the cohesiveness and the continuity of the efforts by the Toledo Independents and the Milwaukee Social Democrats. There was never any strong third party organization or leader who could unite different groups of people into common cause as, say, the Socialists had done in Milwaukee. As a result working-class groups, Socialists, and women's organizations lacked a focal point, an area around which divergent community forces might gather to directly assault the dominant political system. School reform in Rochester and Kansas City, therefore, was not a reflection of the dominant views of ascendant third party leadership as in Toledo and Milwaukee but rather the sum total of individual efforts by external reform groups that lacked such long range intergroup cooperation.

Despite recurrent efforts to rally organized workers into the political arena, Rochester's labor movement paled in significance compared to Milwaukee's Federated Trade Council. With the depression of the Nineties as a backdrop, Socialists and trade union radicals tried to set a political spark in the laboring classes and other citizens. An Independent Political

Labor League had already been formed in the early 1890s which challenged the political dominance of the two parties; its flame was bright but brief.[82] When the Socialists tried to infiltrate the Monroe County Labor Congress in the mid-Nineties and build it into a powerful third party unit, they were repelled by the unions tied to the American Federation of Labor. The same difficulties faced the Socialists who tried to seize power within the Rochester Trades Assembly, still a bastion of the Knights of Labor late in the decade. Socialists like William Lippelt of the Tailor's Union as well as socialist shoemakers, typesetters, and other skilled workers continually urged political action by their peers with negligible results. By 1897, as the worst aspects of the depression disappeared and these third party movements had failed to materialize, prominent trade unions eschewed political participation and continued to view their organizations as economic instruments for better wages and working conditions.[83]

In the early twentieth century, Rochester's most prominent trade union leaders still agitated for political action but rarely enjoyed electoral success. After 1905, for example, labor groups engaged in serious political organizing. As usual their political forays were unproductive. The labor presence in the city was certainly quite visible in the new century. Labor Day parades, for example, only grew from 5,000 marchers in 1901 to 6,000 in 1906, but by 1907 the number reached 15,000 men and women. It was in that year, marked by an economic slowdown and a business panic, that the new Central Trades and Labor Council (the replacement for the defunct Trades Assembly in 1900) made its only serious political bid.[84]

Early in the Spring of 1906, the editor of the Labor Journal reported that the majority of the trade unions in Rochester planned to join other independents in a third party challenge to Boss Aldridge. George Aldridge's Republican Party was seemingly invincible in Rochester and Monroe County politics. An Independent League was nevertheless formed which, it was hoped, would "cause anxiety to 'Uncle' George Aldridge." Urging the municipal ownership of utilities as well as the direct election of Senators, the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, the League wanted to "break the bi-partisan alliance existing in this city between political bossism and private monopoly."[85] The platform was similar to third party agitators in other cities. The Central Trades and Labor Council overcame its usual political reticence and formally endorsed the Independent ticket, which caused a local stir equal to the one in Toledo when the local unions backed the state Socialist ticket in 1908.

As the Rochester elections neared, the Journal editorialized that, "Despite frequent discouragements and the continual protesting of unprogressive and timid members, there is a strong sentiment among the trade unionists of the country in favor of united political action. The further the active unionist goes into the ever broadening field of labor legislation the deeper becomes his conviction that the labor giant should exert the power he possesses at the polls and cease to petition at the feet of lawmakers who neither respect nor fear him."[86] This hope for more politically astute wage workers had sprung eternal in the history of the local labor movement, but 1907 was not to be their year of destiny and achievement. After two years of campaigning, the Independent League only succeeded in electing a union worker as New York's new Secretary of State.

Rochester's labor press had been filled with proposals for working-class entry into politics in the early 1900s. Most of them were undoubtedly veiled threats aimed at the major parties, hoping that more attention would be paid to pro-labor legislation such as factory inspection and the rigid enforcement of child labor laws. Socialists were well represented in the garment and clothing unions, a fertile ground historically for progressive trade unionism. Unfortunately for them, the Central Trades and Labor Council was controlled by men like Martin Kovaleski, who was vehemently opposed to the Socialists.[87] In spite of several efforts by Socialist Party members to better their relations, there were weak links between them and the mainstream labor unions, unlike the mutual interests of groups like the S.D.P.

and the F.T.C. in Milwaukee. As the city became increasingly white collar due to the rise of Eastman Kodak and related industries in the twentieth century, the trade union base was further weakened. Third party movements then faced even greater struggles against the dominant parties.

All of this directly impinged on the political development of the Socialists, who met at the city hall from the turn of the century to 1911 through the good graces of Boss Aldridge and the Republicans. In their Labor lyceum, formed in 1896, the Socialists continually attacked their hosts, called for an abandonment of the major parties by all workers, and urged the establishment of a new social order. The Lyceum kept the hopes for political and social reconstruction alive in an environment controlled by the Republican party and the mediating influence of the Good Government forces. Socialists assailed the imperfections of the capitalist order and invited speakers before the Lyceum contributed many radical criticisms for local debate. The Rochester Socialists were better debaters than organizers. They failed to energize large segments of laboring people or women's groups behind their cause.

Socialists here as elsewhere felt a strong bond with radicals in other parts of the nation and the world. As the Rochester Socialist argued in 1907, "the socialists of Rochester are but a small part of the great international movement, which is the expression of a world wide proletarian rising against a condition which renders all workers slaves."[88] Through their speeches, writings, and occasional publications, the Rochester Socialists spoke out against poverty, boss rule, and injustice. While the Milwaukee Socialists were preparing to take control of their city, however, their comrades in New York were subjected to police intimidation. Golden Rule Jones had taken the clubs away from the Toledo police force, but that policy did not prevail in Aldridge's Rochester. In 1908 the members of the Italian Socialist Federation (which was forever being confused with anarchist groups) were harassed and jailed for "alleged inflammatory speeches." In reality, on that occasion they were probably only celebrating the life of an Italian free thinker and national hero. Polish Socialists faced the same tactics, and police in 1911 arrested a number of the most prominent Socialists in the city, including a University of Rochester professor, for "obstructing the sidewalk."[89]

While Toledo Progressives organized to gain district representation on the school board, and the Milwaukee Socialists fought for direct elections and sufficient funding for the schools, Rochester lived through the first decade of school board reorganization. Liberal Goo-Goo's and local women had disproportionate representation on these school boards, as Boss Aldridge instructed the Republican mayors to place them on the party ticket in exchange for Good Government support in other areas of municipal politics. Occasionally a letter to the editor would surface locally criticizing the elite membership of the school board--which included shoe manufacturers, elite club women, businessmen, attorneys, and University of Rochester professors--but there was no visible or consolidated effort by excluded grass-roots forces to secure labor representation or district membership.[90]

Without any sort of effective third party mechanism to challenge administrative reforms supported by the city's undisputed boss and local liberals, Socialists and organized labor continually failed to place any of their constituents on the restructured board of education. Liberal men and women gained representation at the expense of some ward leaders as well as Socialist and working-class populations. Lurking in the background was still George Aldridge, who shaped the board personnel in the new century to an even greater degree than he had in the Nineties, when the ward caucus controlled school nominations. Through centralization, Aldridge had fewer offices to contend with and he easily made the board practically all Republican--just as it had been in the previous decade. The idea of a "nonpartisan" school administration was non-existent in practice in Rochester just as it was in Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. Moreover, in Rochester school centralization made the city boss even more powerful than before, and the Goo-Goo's were in a very precarious position even though they remained in his good graces until roughly 1910, when he found them expendable. They served at the pleasure of Boss Aldridge, who controlled the purse strings through his influence on the Board of Estimate, and who with other leading Republicans selected the nominees for public office. The failure of prized liberal reforms like the city's famous social centers was almost foreordained by the way in which Aldridge's power increased over the schools during the Progressive era.[91]

James M. Greenwood's Kansas City similarly lacked a viable third party movement approaching the stature of Toledo's Independents or Milwaukee's Social Democrats. It had all the materials for a united grass-roots political revolt: competing Socialist parties, a stable German language worker's paper, and a reasonably strong labor movement. With the largest network of P.T.A.'s in the world and the existence of strong women's organizations generally, all of the elements might have congealed to challenge the decades-long supremacy of Superintendent Greenwood and the school board. The Republicans and the Democrats frustrated all critics by controlling all the nominations to the "bi-partisan" school board on the major tickets, and social innovation and curricular change often occurred only through continual agitation from outside the system.

The Kansas City Star claimed as early as 1891 that "the grievous oppression of labor is no longer possible in America, for there is a sense of justice among the people which will not allow it. The whole trend of public sentiment is in the direction of an enlargement of the rights and privileges of labor, and regulations which favor the toiling masses."[92] The "toiling masses" found it virtually impossible to engage in any sort of meaningful challenge against the major parties which controlled their schools. Decades of struggle by some for a representative on the school board only produced disappointment and failure. This resulted largely from the apolitical stance of the Industrial Council, comprised mostly of unions loyal to the A.F.L. Whenever dissenting unions within the council pushed the parent body to enter politics, they lacked the political savvy and strength to translate their sense of political and educational injustice into victory at the polls. In 1893 many unions in the Council endorsed a "workingmen's ticket," since "the working classes of the city had derived no benefits from voting the party ticket."[93] The following year they briefly coalesced with Single Taxers, Socialists, and other dissidents in a Labor Reform movement, again with disappointing results.

The official organ of Kansas City's trade unions, the Midland Mechanic, quite typically concluded in this atmosphere in 1898 that "we do not believe it to be expedient for a union to take concerted action in politics. It is not a wise policy." At the same time workers fully realized that "the absence of political power to back up the demands of the trade unions is responsible for the deplorable condition of the toilers."[94] The working-class, quasi-Socialist Missouri Staats-Zeitung warned in 1901 that until workers broke completely with the major parties, they should not expect better industrial conditions. If workers lacked power, "it is their own fault," claimed one writer. "They can't blame the plutocrat for looking after his own interests."[95] Two years later the Industrial Council tried to heed these warnings on the need for political organization. The majority of Kansas City's unions formed a Union Labor Party, which had the Declaration of Independence for its guiding principle along with specific demands for democratic voting devices and municipal control of the street railway. By the end of 1904, the inability of the new party to assault the existing political structure marked another dismal effort in the attempted politicization of the labor movement.[96]

In their failure to join together with the trade unions to form a strong third party alternative, the Kansas City Socialists replicated the situation occurring in Rochester and many other cities. While overstating their case somewhat, historians A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Dorsett have noted that Socialism was rarely taken seriously in Kansas City in the Progressive era and that "it had no measurable effect on the place of labor organization in public opinion."[97] Some efforts, however, were made by the Midland Mechanic to better relations with various Socialists. It sometimes praised the leadership of the new Social Democratic Party formed in Milwaukee, and Christian Socialism was a common topic of discussion among labor leaders.[98] Still, it is clear that the paths of Socialist and labor organizers crossed but did not often meet. Most of the members of the Kansas City Socialist Labor Party were skilled workers and union men, but the Industrial Council never endorsed it at the polls. In fact, when the Union Labor Party entered politics in 1904, its vote was split by the competing Socialist ticket. The regular parties, noted the German language Kansas City Presse, therefore benefited by the split between these two grass-roots forces.[99] The Milwaukee trade unions and the Socialists had faced a similar situation but had the leadership necessary to bridge the gap between different sources of reform. In contrast, the politics of cooperation was absent in Kansas City throughout the Progressive era.

Trade unions and Socialists in Kansas City in their own separate ways spent considerable time and effort condemning the structure and elite quality of membership of the local school board. They called for representative democracy but lacked the power to implement desired changes. The working-class Evening Mail called for new blood on the school board as early as 1894. The Staats-Zeitung, in turn, made a typical critique of the school board in 1899, arguing that it was "supposed to be nonpartisan" but was actually a "closed combine." School members "are supposed to be public servants," added the editor, but "once warmly ensconced in their official positions, they defy public opinion" and conduct all their meetings in closed session.[100] The Socialist Labor Party called the school board members "absolutely capitalistic," as it unsuccessfully tried to elect its own members to office.[101] Radicals recognized that educational reform was not a bourgeous undertaking but part of working-class struggle, yet they lacked the power to transform existing power relationships in their city.

Even the less radical Industrial Council had few good words for Kansas City's school board in the Progressive era. The board seemed to enjoy angering the Council by employing non-union labor in schoolhouse construction. In 1906 the Labor Herald claimed that the so-called "non-partisan" plan had been "foisted" on the citizenry in 1880 and "has resulted in the buildup of a machine that has no respect for the rights of the citizens of Kansas City, the pupils or the teachers."[102] Six years later the Herald reiterated this claim, calling the school board "self perpetuating, autocratic, irresponsible...instead of the board being the servants of the people they have become masters."[103] In 1916 a member of the Tailor's Union reflected the pessimism of organized labor when he asserted that the Industrial Council would continue its policy of nominating a laboring man for the school board. "Even if he is not elected, it will be a vote of protest against present conditions in that body which, as at present constituted, is an aristocratic body. You get less out of the Board of Education than you do of any other department of our municipal government."[104]

Neither labor unions nor the Socialists, however, were able to unite into a common front as a third party movement. In 1919 the Industrial Council endorsed the first women in Kansas City to run for the school board, Mrs. Henry Ess, a prominent clubwoman and civic activist since the 1890s. But without school suffrage for women, her friends were unable to help her on election day, and she perished at the polls despite union support. Women, like union laborers, Socialists, and other reformers, failed to join together together to gain representation on the school board. The two major parties kept party nominations tightly controlled and out of their reach. While women were increasingly found on the school boards in Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee after the turn of the century, in Kansas City they were primarily limited to agitating with other grass-roots forces from outside the power structure. In that way much of their leadership potential was undermined, even if they succeeded in promoting a number of the programs of the "new education" in the city at the bend of the Missouri.[105]

In all of these cities, therefore, school reform proceeded in a larger social and political environment. The shape of schooling is to an important degree always a product of its surrounding environment. Educational policy in the Progressive era, like all periods before and after, reflected changes outside the system. Without the rise of various competing sources of reform in the depression Nineties, schooling would have been subjected to different personalities, social theories, and viewpoints. None of the important changes in the configurations of urban schooling at the turn of the century--from school board centralization to penny lunches--are explicable without reference to the social forces that gave rise to movements for change. Women, organized labor, Socialists, and other reformers who first became visible critics of school and society in the Nineties remained in different degrees influential sources of social change in urban education through the early decades of the twentieth century.

Municipal reform clearly differed in dramatic ways in various cities. Toledo and Milwaukee had qualitatively different political environments than Rochester and Kansas City, and there was no mistaking the difference between a mayor who took clubs away from the police and one who didn't. Socialists met without fear of reprisal in Toledo and Milwaukee but with expectations of reprisal in a city like Rochester. Toledo's Independents and Milwaukee's Social Democrats partially overturned long traditions of third party failure, while the established parties in Rochester and Kansas City made short work of several challenges by local political upstarts. All of this provided an environment in which school reform and curricular change would proceed in the early decades of this century.

The political environments of these two sets of cities therefore differed markedly. Now, however, one must turn from an analysis of the political history of municipal reform to a social analysis of actual educational policy and practice. Only then can one determine the differences that varying environments made in the history of school innovation. For example, did the existence of viable third parties that were interested in social and educational reconstruction guarantee the establishment of more widespread reforms than were possible in cities under regular party rule? How did different political developments affect the timing and pace of educational change and social service innovation? How close did specific schools come to the Deweyian ideal of the school as a center of neighborhood life and social and intellectual stimulation? How widespread, for example, were the various decentralized programs that were established under newly centralized systems? Only by moving away from the social and political context of reform, closer to the operations of different programs and services in varying environments, can one hope to answer such questions about the immediate and long range effects of the age of municipal reform on the urban school.

Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, And Educational Extension

Is it not poor economy for the city to spend millions of dollars of public money in the erection of buildings for the use of the children and then to allow these buildings to remain unused for months, while the children are running the streets, forming bad habits, and losing a great part of that which they have gained in the public schools during the previous year?

An N.E.A. address on vacation
schools, 1898

There is much educational value in a pile of sand.

The Children's Playground League
of Rochester, 1907

I

"Recent years have demonstrated the need in this city of a new kind of education," wrote Charles L. Aarons, an attorney and the President of the Milwaukee school board in 1910. "The call of the persecuted and oppressed, of the weak and the delinquent has been listened to. Despite the fact that the funds of the Board were never originally contemplated to supply such needs--now so urgent--the School Board has attempted to come to the rescue of neglected and suffering humanity. There was no one else--no other institution or body which undertook to perform this duty--a duty which devolved upon society itself through some one of its agencies."[1] While worried that the "new education" progressed too rapidly against the old and certain that the schools could not single-handedly cure every social ill, Aarons still applauded the rapid expansion of the social role of the schools after the turn of the century. Innovations like vacation schools, playgrounds, social centers, classes for stammerers, the blind, the deaf, and the feeble-minded, and extensive programs in manual training, domestic science, and even vocational training had become in a few short years the trademarks of a modern urban school system.

Aarons in particular believed that "the tendency in this and other School Boards has been that anything new, appealing to the Board as inherently meritorious, must be adopted, without giving due thought to the proper relationship between such new ventures and the basic principles upon which the system should rest, and without proper consideration of the possible result of crowding out of the system certain of the old departments which were thereby injuriously affected."[2] If new was not always better and possibly harmful, descriptions of rapid changes in the urban schools and considerations of their overall significance were widespread in many superintendent's reports, educational addresses, and newspaper editorials during the Progressive era in many areas like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. Both professional educators and lay people alike rightly understood that they were living in a new era, a period distinctively different from the pre-1890s and full of import for the future. "Ten years ago it was the fashion to call any man who worked for reform and helped to disclose corruption a knocker," argued the Missouri Staats-Zeitung in 1906.[3] But now it was commonly agreed that all cities and their social institutions were in the wake of the "general reform movement sweeping over the country."[4]

Three closely-related educational reforms that reflected the new spirit for change were vacation schools, playgrounds, and the general movement for "school extension." The latter idea included a wealth of programs--such as school gardens, evening schools, and children's and adult's recreational classes--that were all essentially subsumed by contemporaries under the title "social center." Together with the vacation schools and playgrounds, the social centers became one of the most important reforms sought by many grass-roots Progressives. Different segments of the grass roots disagreed on the extent to which school administrations should be centralized and professionalized and whether at-large membership on the school board should eclipse ward leadership. But all of these reformers for their own reasons believed that the school should form the central institution in the local neighborhood, the starting point for all efforts at social amelioration. Despite the obvious differences between various elements of the grass roots, Social Gospelers, women, labor unions, Socialists, Populists, and parent organizations all championed these new programs. These innovations were dramatic examples of the new spirit of social service that informed municipal debates in the political arena and helped alter the urban schools.

An examination of the implementation of significance of these various programs in different urban environments contributes greatly to an understanding of the rise of modern social services in education in the early twentieth century. In many ways, for example, detailed case studies of these and other innovations in different urban environments explain whether the schools underwent "transformation" after the turn of the century. It also clarifies the degree to which different centralized school boards and professionalized administrations influenced the rate at which various innovations entered specific neighborhoods. Examining the ethnic, class, and racial dimensions of policy making in relation to the life of these programs provides clues to the nature of local school reform often missing in general surveys of the period. How widespread were these innovations? What factors determined which specific neighborhoods received particular programs? What accounts for the timing and pace of change in different urban environments? To what extent was attorney Aarons correct in asserting that the new education was "crowding out of the system" older aspects of schooling?

Answering these questions involves an evaluation of the impact of several social services as well as greater attention to the interaction between those individuals who David B. Tyack calls the "administrative progressives" and various grass-roots agitators.[5] A study of vacation schools, playgrounds, and social centers also enables the historian to analyze critically the concept of social service that guided several new educational policies. The origins of new, decentralized programs were assuredly complex. In the broadest sense innovations like vacation schools and playgrounds were a response to perceived social problems that stemmed from urbanization, industrialization, and immigration. Since many innovations like social centers were championed by groups that lacked full representation on local school boards, the addition of new services also seemed to be a reaction against administrative, bureaucratic, and elite consolidation. By the turn of the century, many community activists wanted the schools brought closer to neighborhoods that now lacked formal representation, for they believed that new programs secured social improvement for disadvantaged children and parents and the citizenry in general.

Many modern historians of education who have analyzed these particular programs have adopted E. A. Ross's position in Social Control (1901) that school expansion during the Progressive era as in other periods was merely a way to control and discipline potentially unruly and turbulent populations. Established at a time of acute social dislocation, various innovations attempted to reintegrate society by disciplining the children of immigrants and the poor and by socializing them to American values. Joel Spring, for example, in Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, argues that advocates of such programs as social centers identified strongly with the corporate state and industrial capitalism and "tempered their idea of democratic fraternalism with elitist concepts."[6] Paul C. Violas, in turn, in The Training of the Urban Working Class, has similarly argued that Progressive social service innovations were instruments of social stability. Programs that "began for seemingly intrinsic and altruistic reasons" were actually tools of manipulation and the status quo.[7]

The schools of Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City were all affected in different degrees by the establishment of vacation programs, playgrounds, and social centers. These innovations were integral efforts at community improvement through school reform. Like urban Progressivism itself, which was an amalgam of different grass-roots forces and third party movements that crossed paths on many different issues, these innovations matured in an atmosphere of conflict, debate, and struggle. Their history was not simply one of social control and elite manipulation. That perspective too often treats children and parents, especially of the various layers of the working class, as mere objects of reform--static, totally dependent, and inactive forces incapable of choosing between desirable and undesirable innovations.

Too often, both liberal historians and recent critics oversimplify the motives of Progressive reformers. Liberals like Cremin tend to equate educational change with progress: reformers sought social justice and a more democratic social order. More radical analysts, however, offer a more critical but similarly one-sided perspective: reformers were elitists, not democrats, and they sought social control, not liberation or equal opportunity. Unfortunately, neither historical school recognizes that "reformers" were a mixed lot. People with contradictory world views and social and political interests often endorsed the same social service innovation during the Progressive era. That is, to advocate vacation schools, playgrounds, social centers, and additional reforms did not necessarily brand citizens either as champions of control or democracy. Frequently different people saw different possibilities in the same identical program. And, as will soon be evident, historians of all persuasions need to connect the history of ideas and the social intent of various activists with the social history of schools and neighborhoods, with the clients of Progressive educational reform.

II

"Vacation schools have become an important part of our public school system," wrote Adele Marie Shaw in a popular series of articles on education for the *World's Work* in 1904.[8] Operated for several weeks in the summer by Progressive women for the children of the poor, the vacation schools were one of the best publicized experimental programs of the Progressive era. Numerous articles on them appeared in educational journals like the *Elementary School Teacher*, in professional journals like the *American Journal of Sociology*, in welfare magazines like *Survey* and *Charities*, and in popular magazines like the *Outlook* and the *Review of Reviews*. Local newspapers also extensively reported on the innovation. Initiated primarily by voluntary associations and women's clubs, it spread to dozens of American cities after 1900 and ultimately received municipal funding in many of them. Like many contemporary reformers, Clarence A. Perry, the efficiency advocate, viewed the vacation school as part of "the wider use of the school plant," an important example of how contemporaries reshaped the urban school to provide larger service to the community.[9]

The vacation school became one of the most successful and best known innovations of reform-minded women in the early Progressive era. A few vacation schools had operated in Newark and

Boston before the 1890s, but their heyday occurred primarily after the depression of 1893 motivated many women's groups to seek social reform. The role of the private sector, rather than professional educators, in promoting these schools is indisputable. A well-known chronicler of the vacation schools and a national leader of the playground movement, Henry S. Curtis, wrote in a government report in 1905 that the "work was started in the first instance in nearly every case by philanthropic societies," mostly comprised of women.[10] The Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, the City Federation of Women's Clubs of Toledo, the Women's Club of Wisconsin of Milwaukee, and the Athenaeum of Kansas City were primarily responsible for funding and operating vacation schools in their respective cities, and their activism reflected the zeal of women's associations elsewhere. With the increased establishment of vacation schools, part of the new education arrived in town, and it was largely due to the perseverance and labor of women.

The vacation school, however, was ultimately endorsed by labor unions, Socialists, Populists, and even school officials in the early twentieth century. While suspicious of those who viewed educational innovations as ends-in-themselves, Socialists viewed the vacation schools and other innovations as an immediate form of relief and welfare; they were desirable though certainly less important than a full-fledged assault on the capitalist dominance over the political economy. Liberal reformers more generally saw the innovation as a partial answer to the poverty of poor children's environments. In the Nineties, liberal women used these schools as an instrument for social experimentation; such instrumentalism was the heart of Progressive schooling. "One of the chief functions of vacation schools," argued a writer in The Forum in 1900, "is that of serving as experiment stations, so that these schools exert a positive influence upon regular school methods...The instruction is, briefly, according to the laboratory method."[11] Women in city after city emphasized the experimental nature of the innovation. They also funded it privately and, with the aid of diverse voluntary groups, lobbied for its permanent establishment in the schools.

Miss Beulah Douglas, a very popular vacation school teacher in Milwaukee, asserted in 1902 that the "work is experimental; what is considered best one year may not be feasible the next. This elasticity is of great value, for when methods become cut and dried, growth ceases."[12] In regards to the vacation school at the Sixth District School, located in a slum neighborhood, the Milwaukee Free Press concurred with Douglas' viewpoint. The vacation schools were in reality "pedagogic experiment stations," wrote the paper during the same year. "The new ideas which are to be tried in this school may later be adopted in the grades of the public schools if they are found to be thoroughly practical and feasible. The idea of taking care of the children and keeping them off the streets in the hot summer is, to be sure, a philanthropic one, but it is not the primary object of the vacation school. Educators expect much of the vacation in the way of solving problems which have disturbed teachers in the lower grades for years."[13]

With many of these objectives in mind, reformers established vacation schools in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City at the turn of the century. Typically, women's organizations received permission from their school board to use particular buildings free of charge in the summer months, usually for six weeks. Because of regulations that prohibited the use of the schools for other than regular school purposes, women usually drafted a round of petitions to ward leaders until their proposal was finally accepted. The terms of agreement were fairly simple: the women paid for the teachers and the instruction materials, the school board provided the building. Under these conditions women first created vacation schools in Rochester and Milwaukee in 1899 and in Toledo and Kansas City in 1901.

Fiscal as well as pedagogical conservatives were always suspicious of the ulterior motives of the women who, they realized, wanted their own positions on the school board and saw the vacation schools as a way to publicize their ideas and enhance their visibility generally in the city. Although many groups claimed to be "non-partisan," everyone recognized that most people who used that phrase were actually political activists. As the vacation schools gained increased public support in the Progressive era, and as voluntary associations gained more membership on the school board, the trend was clearly away from private to municipal funding. By 1910 all of these cities had municipally-funded vacation schools.[14]

Women reformers and other champions of vacation schools used various justifications for the establishment of this innovation. They provided long explanations of the evil effects of street associations on children, of the tendency toward increased juvenile crime in the summer months, and of the potential which vacation schools had in countering these conditions. "There are sections of the city where the streets fairly swarm with children," noted Rochester's Helen B. Montgomery in 1899. A leader in the Women's Union and a school board member from 1900 to 1909, she also added that many children "are near no park, the houses are small, the streets hot and dusty, the associations demoralizing."[15] The City Federation of Women's Clubs in Toledo similarly argued that the experimental schools would teach "the love of nature, consideration for each other, and wholesome recreation."[16] In Milwaukee, the Woman's Club of Wisconsin and the Woman's School Alliance made similar assertions on the social order produced by the schools. The President of the Milwaukee school board, William Pieplow, a former Populist and associate of Victor Berger but now a steadfast Republican, wrote in 1909 that the incorporation of these schools into the public system promoted stability on the Streets. The vacation schools, he wrote, eliminated "habits of indolence and lawlessness" and the "destructive infection of evil associations and enforced idleness." Moreover, they taught "law and order without the discipline and pressure of the ordinary school."[17]

Many recent historians have accepted such law and order statements at face value and presumed that the vacation schools must have primarily functioned as instruments of social control. What they have ignored, of course, is the fact that many petitioners, faced with conservative, business-dominated, and efficiency-conscious school boards, had to justify any desire for additional school expenses in law and order terms. Many women's groups assuredly believed that their experimental schools would retard juvenile crime in the summer months, but they were equally interested in using these schools for educational experimentation. Moreover, historians often ignore the possibility that many parents disliked summer crime as well as juvenile delinquency--no matter what the cause--and might have preferred supervised education and recreation for their children than absolute freedom; parents too have an interest in various forms of social control. Many Socialist parties explicitly sought to change ownership of the means of production rather than to establish a capitalist welfare state.[18] Yet they also endorsed new social services and experimental programs, even though they disagreed with liberal reformers on the ends of social policy.

Both liberal and radical reformers commonly agreed that class differences greatly determined how children spent their summer months. There was widespread acceptance of the belief that "when summer comes, the rich leave for seashore or mountain; the poor remain [in the city], perforce of circumstances, to swelter in the heat."[19] Numerous individuals with conflicting political philosophies believed that new programs offered some immediate compensation for the larger inequalities children faced in their lives. Hence the Women's Educational and Industrial Union therefore tried to provide more educational and constructive experiences not for all children but for "the eighteen or twenty thousand who stay in town all summer long; who play up and down dirty streets."[20] Emily Bouton, a prominent new woman in Toledo, similarly argued that poverty trapped many little children in the city, which forced them into crime-ridden environments. Society, in turn, blamed the children for their summer pranks and petit larceny when in reality they had nowhere else to play but the city streets. A follower of Golden Rule Jones, Bouton believed that social services like vacation schools were a recognition of the Golden Rule and an appreciation of the environmental determinants of proper child rearing.[21] Like the women in the Kansas City Athenaeum, the Milwaukeeans who financed various vacation schools recognized that poverty prevented many children from enjoying simple pleasures like an out-of-town vacation.[22]

Vacation schools involved more than the simple controlling of children. In the first place, contemporary reformers emphasized that these institutions had voluntary attendance. Emily Bouton of Toledo noted that "if they do not like what they find there, these boys and girls can stay away" if they so desired.[23] That does not mean that poor or working-class children had many options in terms of supervised or organized play, given their parents' economic status, but the history of the schools in cities across the nation demonstrates that they were unquestionably popular. There is considerable evidence that many parents and children valued the six week sessions, even if historians dismiss them as examples of the innate conservatism of liberal reforms. Vacation schools should be criticized less for their innate conservativism and more for the fact that they reached very few children of the total population and never greatly altered the character of the public schools. Demand always outstripped supply, however, whenever women's organizations established vacation schools. In a voluntary situation, children and parents would have shunned these schools if they did not offer some people useful and refreshing alternatives to the city street.

The popularity of the vacation schools stemmed from their innovative qualities and relaxed environments. Programs differed annually in various cities. Cities like Chicago, for example, emphasized nature study. Others favored industrial subjects or a mixture of various activities. Still, activities common to many cities included field trips to the country, excursions to outlying parks, manual training and domestic science, museum visits, story telling, plays, kindergarten work, and visits to local points of historical interest. Often the casual study of local history and geography was also pursued through invited lectures, library visits, and trips through the city. With a curriculum that mostly ignored textbooks and emphasized "learning by doing," the vacation schools offered an alternative to boring afternoons and to the singsong drills and recitations and usual subjects in the regular classroom.[24]

In reference to the progress of the vacation schools in Milwaukee, Charities, a prominent social welfare journal, believed in 1902 that "if attendance is a straw showing which way the wind is blowing in educational methods, no greater endorsement is needed for the vacation school than the story of the past year."[25] The experimental schools had a magnetic influence, drawing children from all parts of the city. "The idea of vacation schools for the children of the poor is now accepted by everyone," claimed an enthusiastic writer in the Elementary School Teacher in 1905. "The demand for them far exceeds the supply."[26] Nearly all of the earliest vacation schools in the nation were indeed begun in the poorest, often immigrant-populated sections of the city; these places usually lacked sufficient open spaces for play except for occasional vacant lots and the city street. Even though some cities like Rochester and Kansas City in particular were building nationally-renowned park systems, these spots of green were often miles from tenement districts and accessible only to those with money for carfare. What was needed, according to reformers, were more accessible programs of activity in local neighborhoods. And, in neighborhood after neighborhood where vacation schools were founded, there was literally a rush for the limited places available at these schools, angry confrontations with parents whose children were denied admittance, and the very success that women had long desired in the field of municipal reform and child welfare.

The ward leaders of the Rochester school board had notably attacked the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in the Nineties as meddlers and faddists. With continual prodding by the Good Government League and Susan B. Anthony, Helen B. Montgomery, and their cohorts, the Board finally permitted the Union to open one vacation school in 1899. Located at the No. 9 school, an area inhabited principally by Russian Jews and Italians, the innovation was a complete success. The principal of the school, Anna Van Marten Jones, wrote that "the eagerness of parents and children to obtain places in the school was beyond our expectation."[27] Five hundred children vied for two hundred places, producing many disappointments. Children so enjoyed the activities, especially the excursions to the city's parks, that the Union and Advertiser repeatedly noted that more children were turned away annually than permitted to enter the schools. "Pathetic were the appeals for admittance," noted the paper in 1903, "and so many children turned sadly away from the building."[28] There were folk dances, story telling, and other programs that appealed to different immigrant groups, and the Women's Union always had more children to teach than they could accommodate.

Toledo's Federation of Women's Clubs began vacation schools in 1901 with the aid of Golden Rule Jones, the Complete Education League, and the Broadway Civic Club, a parents' club from the South Side.[29] Like their Rochester counterparts, Toledo reformers established the first school in the poorest and most congested part of town: the East Side. Separated from the rest of the city culturally by its large Hungarian and ethnic populations, physically by its imposing steel mills and the gray tint to its skies, and geographically by the Maumee River, the East Side had the heaviest concentration of industry in Toledo. Even the names of some of the neighborhood schools reflected the larger working-class and the industrial environment as, for example, Ironville and Birmingham. Pauline Steinem, the Christian Socialist women's club leader, school board member (1905-1909), and advocate of the new education, spent countless hours with poor East Side children in the summer months. She was the chair of the vacation school committee of the women's clubs and an indefatigable school reformer. The Toledo Blade, which was usually skeptical of most social welfare programs, claimed that the schools were "unsuccessful from every point of view."[30] For every hundred children who went on a field trip, twice as many were turned away for lack of funds and space. Women were never able to raise all the money needed to accommodate all the children from the district.

The situation was very similar in Milwaukee and Kansas City. In the latter place the Athenaeum and the Council of Women's Clubs privately operated the vacation schools for over a decade starting in 1901.[31] In Milwaukee, the Women's Club of Wisconsin, aided by the ubiquitous Woman's School Alliance, started them in 1899, sponsoring the schools until the school board began to fund them five years later. In 1899 the Milwaukee Journal, like so many other newspapers, noted the great demand for these innovations. Many of the children at the vacation school were exceedingly poor. When five hundred of them were taken to outlying parks in the city, one observer wrote that "the beauty of the woods was a revelation of most of them, many never having been so far away from home before...it was pathetic to hear their expressions of delight on all sides."[32] Entire Italian families went on much appreciated and enjoyable excursions on Lake Michigan, as the philosophy of social service and wider use of the schools found expression in Milwaukee.

By the turn of the century even the Republican Sentinel publicized how "one school conducted last summer was filled to overflowing, demonstrating the great desire both on the part of children and parents to avail themselves of the advantages to be had at these schools."[33] Much of their popularity emanated from the relaxed environments, the stimulating activities, and the enthusiasm of particular teachers. Miss Beulah Douglas, for example, was an extremely popular teacher in the Milwaukee vacation schools, and all of the available accounts of her teaching points to her talents and love for children. Miss Douglas taught in Minneapolis during the regular year. When she visited Milwaukee, children routinely tagged behind her, hoping for a guarantee that their name would be included on the vacation school roster.

In 1902 over seven hundred children from across the city stood in line for admittance to the vacation school in the Sixth District neighborhood. Many of the children were poor and ragged and, as the Sentinel reported, "the youngsters came from all quarters of the city in twos and threes and in squads of a dozen or more." For those who were turned away, "the big tears that ran down their disappointed faces told in epitome the whole story of Miss Douglas' success in her vacation school work."[34] Poignant scenes like these melted many hearts. School board members like Jeremiah Quin, who had long opposed vacation schools as a fad in the Nineties, visited the local experimental classes, became convinced of their popularity and utility, and led the effort for municipal funding of the vacation schools after the turn of the century.

Discipline as it was normally understood at the time was never a major problem at the vacation schools. As a writer argued in the American Journal of Sociology regarding the Chicago vacation schools, "The discipline in the schools was something remarkable. No children were sent away permanently for bad conduct, and there was but little need of reprimands."[35] Many of the women's clubs petitioned unsuccessfully for the abolishment of corporal punishment in the public schools. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester nevertheless believed that the vacation schools had demonstrated the value of relaxed and more informal learning environments and the benefits of "gentle training." The principal of its school contended that "the word discipline seemed unnecessary to speak" because children were so involved in new activities.[36] The Federation of Women's Clubs of Toledo took over 15,000 children on excursions to the parks in 1902 without any unpleasant incidents or so-called discipline problems, and the same was essentially true of the experiences of the women's organizations in Milwaukee, Kansas City, and other places.[37]

Children seemed to attend the vacation schools with more excitement than the regular public schools. Discipline was not a problem in part because attendance was voluntary: children who disliked these schools probably stayed away from them. Hence, those children deemed by some reformers as potential juvenile and adult criminals probably avoided social manipulation. Moreover, given the intense competition to gain admittance, children ordinarily viewed the vacation schools as a privilege rather than an effort by elite women to manipulate and control them. The Rochester Union and Advertiser claimed that the No. 9 vacation school was popular because of "the character of the institution and work done" there.[38] Sometimes children so enjoyed the park excursions, manual training, domestic science, and story telling that they attended these schools for six weeks in the summer without missing a single day. Children at No. 9 competed for prizes for their work in neighborhood beautification, which included the destruction of caterpillars that were ravaging the city's trees. Little Ella Davis received a copy of Grimm's Fairy Tales for destroying 7,700 cocoons. "The boy's first prize was equally won by Isaac Cohen and William Newsclaum, who destroyed so many cocoons that they could not be counted."[39] For destroying an estimated 50,000 cocoons, Isaac and Bill received a penknife and a baseball.

Many parents, no doubt, utilized the vacation schools as a form of summer day care, especially when they were convinced that children enjoyed the experience. In many of Milwaukee's ethnic neighborhoods, working-class parents often donated money to the vacation school fund, partially because they hoped that a place would be found for their own children. In all cities, local women tried to reach the poorest children, those whose families presumably could not affort a middle-class vacation out of town. Hence the children from Milwaukee's Jones Island, a poor fishing village of Poles and Germans, were usually given preference for attendance as well as the Italian children of the Third Ward. The "Bloody Third" was located near the downtown business district and was characterized by slum-like tenements, high rents, and few safe places for children to play.[40]

The Milwaukee Daily News, which was an outgrowth of the Labor News in the Nineties, commonly asserted that the Poles on the South Side and the Italians of the Third Ward eagerly sent their children to the vacation schools. Unfortunately, many of the children were sent home because of overcrowding. For those who did attend the vacation schools, teachers received scores of letters from appreciative parents. Beulah Douglas received what she called "pathetic" pleas from children "begging to be allowed to come to the school" and letters "from the parents who almost invariably write that they are living in a bad neighborhood for children."[41] Every year a number of children were killed in all of these cities while playing in the streets or on railroad tracks, and some parents preferred supervised instruction over complete freedom for their children in choosing a place to play.

Women's clubs in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City gradually expanded their programs to at least a handful in response to rising demand in the early twentieth century. In the process of expanding and popularizing the vacation schools, women's clubs gathered support from other grass-roots organizations and from the men who predominated on the school boards. In 1907 a number of vacation schools were approved by the city council for the Rochester school board. This occurred because of a joint petition for social centers, playgrounds, and vacation schools by eleven community organizations, ranging from the trade unions to the Socialists to the Women's Union. The Socialist Labor Party and a leading suffragette, clubwoman, and Socialist--Mabel Kennon--promised to expand the schools to every neighborhood when they were elected to office. With such broad public support from labor, radical, and women's organizations, Rochester's various experiments in school extension would become nationally publicized through the work of the local school extension director, Edward J. Ward.[42]

This shift from the private to the municipal control of vacation schools was common in many American cities. In Toledo, Pauline Steinem and a school board almost totally united in support of the new education was elected to office in 1904. They replaced the efficiency-minded school board that had been dominated by J. Kent Hamilton and had opposed the new education for six years. Within a year after her election, Steinem led the effort to establish vacation schools at municipal expense. The city solicitor, however, intervened, showing that the state school code did not currently permit the use of tax dollars for school gardens, lunches, social centers, or vacation schools. Undaunted, Steinem joined with the Independents and Brand Withlock and changed the code. By 1910 roughly one-fourth of Toledo's schools had municipally-funded vacation schools; they were found in both wealthy and poor neighborhoods.[43]

Women's club members in Milwaukee and Kansas City also agitated for municipal control of vacation schools after the turn of the century. The Milwaukee women, as previously noted, were successful in 1904; the Kansas City women labored at the task until they triumphed in 1910, when state enabling legislation finally permitted the use of tax monies for these projects. Because David Rose's regime in Milwaukee slashed the public school budget, local school boards that were sympathetic to the expansion of vacation schools were prevented from funding more than a few of them. By 1910 Kansas City had equipped a number of neighborhoods with these schools, while fewer were found in Milwaukee.[44] By this time, however, the vacation schools had begun to lose much of their innovative qualities compared to the Nineties. When the vacation schools were adopted in the Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City schools, they gradually became less experimental and more directed toward aiding children who had failed in their regular school lessons during the year or who needed educational enrichment in particular classes.

The changing character of the vacation school after the turn of the century was a crucial part of its history. This change has generally been ignored by historians, who have treated the vacation school as a static institution. By World War I, however, when all of these cities had adopted vacation schools, they had lost much of their earlier strength as an instrument for reform and educational experimentation. Like many other new programs of the Progressive era, from school breakfasts to domestic science classes, the vacation schools lost their "experimental" character. The movement from private to public control over innovations was common to the history of

Progressive school reform, and in the process experimentalism was often laid at the wayside. While clubwomen at the turn of the century often boasted of how unpredictable the work at the vacation schools might be from year to year, such was rarely the case in the public schools, which had systematized their programs from the earliest years of their existence in the mid-nineteenth century.

There are several reasons for this movement away from the earlier functions of the vacation schools. In the first place, many of the new programs that were popularized in early vacation schools entered the regular schools at the turn of the century. In Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City, for example, complete programs in manual training and domestic science that had been promoted by women's organizations and various civic clubs were now established in the schools in part on the strength of vacation school experiments. Experimentalism soon gave way to formalism in education.

Nearly every child from the kindergarten to the high school now had some exercises in homemaking (for the girls at least) and manual dexterity. In the newly-formed kindergartens, there was paper folding, simple lessons in form and design, and work with colors and paints. All the boys and girls from the first to the sixth grades in many of these cities then typically had occasional work in rafia, weaving, more paper construction, and the use of basic tools. By the sixth or seventh grades, sex role socialization became more pronounced: girls received lessons in cooking and sewing and boys went to shop class. The process by which manual training domestic science entered the schools deserves more extensive analysis by historians, but the vacation school made important contributions to these movements. And although some school board members like Charles Aarons believed that these programs threatened the old system of education, children met in these classes for only an hour or two each week. They never dominated the curriculum or "crowded out" the older subjects as some individuals feared.[45]

What was missing in the regular public schools that adopted these innovations was the flexibility that had been the trademark of earlier vacation schools. Innovative subjects that entered the schools lacked the informal and relaxed environments of earlier private school experiments. And the public schools were not voluntarily attended, so neither were the domestic science and manual training classes. One often attended these classes under compulsion just like the more textbook-oriented subjects that dominated in the schools. Field trips, museum visits, and informal yet valuable learning experiences were added to the public schools because of the work of the vacation schools, but they became an occasional, incidental part of the curriculum. The public schools absorbed many new areas of instruction in the Progressive era but they still lent to many of them their heavy emphasis on textbooks, discipline, rote memorization, and teacher authority. In this respect, the more the schools changed, the more they stayed the same.

The vacation schools that existed in many urban systems after 1910 bore little resemblance to earlier programs except for the fact that they operated in the summer. Between 1910 and 1920, vacation schools became more synonymous with modern conceptions of "summer schools": a place to repeat failed subjects or to do advanced work. They were not especially the sources of new ideas or experimentation. A special report to the National Education Association in 1917 entitled Kansas City and Its Schools made little mention of the earlier experimental functions of the vacation schools, except to say that they had once been operated privately by women. These schools, the report argued, were useful for "backward children" who lagged behind in their regular work.[46] A report by the City Club of Toledo two years later emphasized the same trend that affected many cities.[47] Everyone seemed to forget the initial impulse behind vacation schools, and what had once been an experimental and non-formal alternative to the schools had now joined the system.

Contrary to what social control theorists argue, the privately-funded vacation schools were immensely popular institutions whose greatest fault was perhaps that they reached too few children and failed to refashion the regular schools. In their earliest days these experimental schools offered some children respite from the boredom of hot summer days and were applauded by parents who preferred them over street gangs, loafing, and the many temptations in city streets and alleys. Vacation schools, of course, never transformed the regular schools even if they added some variety to the curriculum. But, like its closely-related reforms of the Progressive era--the playground and the social center--the vacation school was one of the best examples of school expansion and extension during the period. It demonstrated the complex ways in which lay people contributed to the development of new educational ideas on the grass roots.

III

The effects of urban poverty on children's lives was a constant concern of educational reformers during the Progressive era. Throughout such works as Jacob Riis' How the Other Half Lives, Robert Hunter's Poverty, and John Spargo's The Bitter Cry of the Children ran a common interest in the effects of poverty on children's housing, nutrition, education, and overall care. Some of the most famous muckraking photographs of the period show poor children huddling in their dank rooms in tenements, working in notorious sweatshops, or stalking the city street in search of recreational diversion. For reformers of all stripes there were the problems associated with children going to lurid movies, joining street gangs, and shooting craps on the corner. Like the vacation school movement, playgrounds were partially a response to these perceived evils and to threats of juvenile crime, a social concern of all periods of time but an especially dominant fear at the turn of the century. As in so many other areas of reform in the Progressive era, voluntary associations contributed to another important effort at school extension, moving into areas that were once considered a matter of private concern than public policy.

As the price of property rapidly increased due to the inflationary trends of the day and growing populations put increased pressures on certain neighborhoods, local cities had the anomalous situation of having more and more children but fewer and fewer safe places for them to play. Vacant lots and common ground often disappeared, and the most congested neighborhoods in particular replaced spots of green with mortar and brick. Jane Jacobs in The Death and Life of Great American Cities has noted that the streets are often safer and more preferable places for children to play than parks and playgrounds, but at the turn of the century reformers continued the long battle against the street that had earlier characterized school reform in the nineteenth century.[48]

As one contemporary reformer argued in 1903, "the narrow streets become like ovens under the scorching rays of the sun, which beat down from above and reflect from the buildings at all sides." Moreover, continued this writer, the streets were filled not only with questionable characters who taught children to smoke, drink, and curse--the bane of children's existence for generations--but the streets were also injurious to the children's health. "Each gust of wind raises a cloud of dust, which analysis proves to be 95 per cent horse manure, to fill the eyes and lungs of the children."[49] The beautiful parks found in many cities gave little regular relief, since they were often miles from tenement districts and inaccessible for little children who lacked escorts or carfare to reach them. Once again, class differences separated those who had to live in tenements and those who had sizeable back yards. Children born through no fault of their own in congested districts, according to reformers, lacked safe and desirable places to play.

Playgrounds were not an invention of the Progressive era, for they existed next to some local schools in the nineteenth century. Never before, however, had they stirred so much controversy and plans for reform. Numerous organizations formed in American cities which had as their primary aim the creation of playgrounds. And, like so many other innovations, the playground was linked to the most accessible institution for each child: the neighborhood school. As one chronicler of the movement asserted in 1910, the "Playground movement in this country has been begun in nearly every case through private initiative. A Mothers' Club, A Civic Club, or some other private organization begins an agitation."[50]

Because individuals with such diverse social backgrounds and political orientations became involved in reform, it is impossible to explain the history of playground development through a single explanatory device like social control. A wide variety of groups ranging from women's clubs to parent organizations to trade unions and Socialist parties in many different cities lobbied for school playgrounds. And, in addition to general voluntary groups that were interested in many social welfare reforms, the playground movement even had more highly specialized organizations of lay people who lobbied solely for this innovation. Examples included the Children's Playground Association of Toledo (formed in 1899 and the predecessor of the Complete Education League), the Children's Playground League of Rochester (1903), the Milwaukee Outdoor Art and Improvement Association (1903), and the Kansas City Public Playground Association (1908). Comprised of reformers from women's clubs, trade unions, Socialist organizations, and a host of other agencies, these groups fought for suitable areas for organized play.[51]

A writer familiar with the accelerated expansion of public playgrounds near neighborhood schools after the turn of the century noted in The Playground magazine that women were in the forefront of efforts at wider use of the schools for recreation.[52] Even though women did not dominate in the playground movement to the degree that they did in vacation schools, the generalization had general applicability in American cities. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union ran a popular playground in a congested part of Rochester as early as 1899 and with other voluntary groups firmly supported the municipal funding of recreation.[53] The Woman's Suffrage Association of Toledo endorsed playground construction in petitions before the local school board in 1895, when the modern playground movement was just beginning in American cities. In that way it anticipated the later activist role of the City Federation of Women's Clubs and the Women's Educational Club.[54]

In Milwaukee as elsewhere women were prominent in the playground movement. The Woman's Club of Wisconsin, the Woman's School Alliance, the Social Economics Club, the Social Culture Club, and the Council of Jewish Women were involved in most child welfare reforms in their city during the Progressive era, and playgrounds were no exception. And, as in other cities, these women did not stand alone, for the local movement was championed by the men and women in the Children's Betterment League, the South Side Educational Association, the Westminster Civic Club, trade unions, and the Social Democratic Party.[55] Citizens in the Kansas City Public Playground Association built upon the work of the Athenaeum, which had privately funded vacation schools and playgrounds with the aid of mothers' unions after the turn of the century. Women therefore continued to exert considerable influence on social policy related to children's welfare.[56]

Labor unions also contributed notable leadership in the playground movement in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. Winfred Smith, a leader in the Central Trades and Labor Council of Rochester, was an official of the Children's Playground League and nationally prominent in the Playground and Recreation Association of America. In 1907 the Rochester Labor Council "cheerfully" endorsed the work of local playground enthusiasts. The unions attacked proposals by city officials that sought to expand Rochester's beautiful parks but ignored the needs of inner-city children. "We need breathing places for our little ones in the crowded centers of population far more than we need any addition to our large park system," grumbled the Labor Journal in 1907.[57]

The Toledo Union in 1897 similarly applauded the expansion of accessible parks and playgrounds for area children. It especially praised the pioneering work done for the children at Golden Rule Park and Golden Rule Playground, the brainchild of Samuel M. Jones. The Toledo Union Leader, founded in 1907, was also a staunch supporter of more parks and accessible playgrounds.[58]

The Industrial Council of Kansas City even had a working-class poet who conceived of lyrical paths to reform. Entitled "Give Them Playgrounds," his poem read:

How about the little children,
And a place for them to play;
Will the Park Board keep them waiting
Until the Judgement Day?

The children cannot raise a fund
to help their cause along,
But public sentiment you'll find
In their behalf is strong.

We all know that playgrounds
For the children are a boon,
But the motto of the Park Board
Seems to be, "Not Yet, But Soon."[59]

Earlier the ill-fated Labor Political League included children's playgrounds in its municipal platform in 1904, and the labor and Socialist Missouri Staats-Zeitung gave total support to this phase of school extension.[60]

Socialists realized that parks, playgrounds, and other social programs would never eliminate crime or replace their basic goal of redistributing wealth and power in America. Still, they joined with liberal reformers and viewed the establishment of playgrounds as a form of social justice. Rochester's Socialist Labor Party, while further to the left than the Socialist Party, urged municipal playgrounds for children as early as 1899, and the Labor Lyceum banded together with almost a dozen other organizations to secure municipal funding for playgrounds, vacation schools, and social centers in 1907. Socialist clubwoman Mabel Kennon optimistically predicted that when private property was abolished in the future, local children would have many safe places in which to romp and play.[61] Christian Socialists like Golden Rule Jones and prominent clubwomen in Toledo who believed in his principles were also active in the Children's Playground Association. Over in Kansas City, the Socialist Party wrote a long diatribe in 1904 against the school board for lagging behind playground construction and the welfare of the working-classes generally. According to the Socialists, the school board was "absolutely capitalistic, and the class it represents is not interested in taxing itself to give the children of the working class any further facilities for education."[62]

The thousands of trade union members in Milwaukee's Federated Trades Council and in the Social Democratic Party strenuously endorsed playground expansion. As early as 1902, the party platform had playgrounds on its list of educational demands, which soon included lunches, social centers, the direct election of the school board, full funding for the schools, and other ideas that had increased appeal with the grass roots.[63] The Social Democratic Herald and the Milwaukee Leader openly supported civic associations, parent groups, and women's clubs that led the local playground movement. The Leader in particular contained scathing indictments on the failure of the city to provide safe places for children to play. Cartoons showed how children were forced to dodge trolley cars and automobiles, and how they played on garbage dumps and on rooftops because capitalists refused to pay their fair share of taxes and enable Milwaukee to care properly for its children. Emil Seidel, the Socialist mayor in 1910 and alderman for many years, was long remembered in the city as a friend of the children and of playground expansion.[64]

Like the vacation schools, urban playgrounds were often viewed as "experimental" programs, were initially funded privately, and became very popular with many local residents. The Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester opened a playground in a principally Italian neighborhood in 1900. Located at the No. 18 school, which was northeast of central city, the school attracted foreign and native-born children from across Rochester. One day on the overcrowded and popular playground, a newspaper reporter found "all types of miniature humanity: Celtic eyes that twinkled with fun; swarthy little Hungarians; Fritz and Dorothea with florid complexions and round merry faces; Norse boys with blue eyes, flaxen hair and almost defiant look; and the clean-cut classic features of the American girl."[65]

Ethnic stereotypes aside, the playgrounds of Rochester fairly swarmed with all kinds of children. After countering the opposition of local neighbors, the Children's Playground League established a playground at Brown's Square in 1903. Brown's Square had a reputation for radicalism, for it was the traditional location for many labor rallies and Socialist marches through the city. But the Playground League competently established a supervised playground in the area. Literally thousands of children were taken by its members on summer excursions to Rochester's beautiful outlying parks. Social Gospelers, trade union members, women, and other grass-roots activists participated in the local effort, which reportedly yielded splendid results. Commenting on the summer excursions, the Children's Playground League noted that "No one who witnessed the pleasure of the children had a shadow of a doubt of the success of the undertaking, nor did he fail to be personally interested."[66]

The Children's Playground League of Toledo, under the guidance of Golden Rule Jones and assorted liberal reformers, established the city's first supervised playground in 1899. Located on Canton Avenue, a few blocks from downtown in a poor and congested area, the playground was built on an old garbage dump. Jones and other volunteers carried "102 loads of old tin cans, bottles, and like rubbish" away from the site to give children another place to play.[67] The Toledo Blade reported that this "experimental playground" had children "swarming on the lot ever since the work was started," and concluded that such a reform was a good antidote to associations in "the streets and gutters" which often fostered "strong dispositions toward vice and crime."[68]

A large number of social welfare associations contributed to playground development in Milwaukee, and here too the popularity of the innovation was equally striking. Both the Daily News and the Free Press, for example, commented on the popularity of supervised playgrounds, and the Sentinel added that they would help combat vice and crime.[69] One of the first supervised playgrounds established by the Milwaukee Outdoor Art and Improvement Association was on the corner of Greenbush and Mitchell on the Polish South Side. On opening day in 1906, four to five hundred children anxiously awaited their chance to play, and "in rushed hundreds of grimy-faced, ragged youngsters to take possession of the swings, see-saws, and other attractions." "My littlest brother wouldn't eat no dinner, he was so anxious for the playground to open," stated one little girl, who strained her voice trying vainly to coax her brother home.[70] But who could eat when there was a chance to play that popular game, mumble-the-peg?

Not everyone liked the playground movement. Overcrowding and boisterous activity at the playgrounds occasionally became a source of conflict and neighborhood complaint. Social control theorists, of course, have primarily argued that the playgrounds were an exercise in social manipulation and have focused almost exclusively on the intellectual rather than the social history of play.[71] That is, they deal with the intent of many reformers but not the children themselves. These writers fail to deal with children as conscious, active folk who have means and motives--sometimes quite contrary ones.

Parks and playgrounds were indeed tauted from time to time by reformers as breeding grounds of good citizenship, Americanization, and civic virtue. Liberals, radicals, and even conservative curmudgeons grudgingly admitted that the playgrounds offered alternatives to the street and to environments that nurtured impure thoughts and questionable behavior. "Play is instrumental and helpful indeed in making Americans of foreigners," claimed a confident writer in The Playground in 1912, and tons of paper and ink were sacrificed in the effort to prove that organized play hindered crime.[72] But did the playgrounds in any way attain any of these ends? And, given the popularity of the institutions with many children, can it be concluded that children and their parents approved of these objectives? Or, on the other hand, did parents and children disagree on the motives of many reformers but still approve of the idea of municipal funding for safe and supervised places to play?

No matter what the intent of different advocates of school playgrounds, the innovations often became a convenient place for children to learn to smoke, drink, fight, and curse. By congregating larger numbers of children into a smaller space than was possible on many city streets, playgrounds in some instances became an even better source of social disorder than any previously available. Undoubtedly many children were socialized to orderly values, Americanized to some degree, and taught discipline, cooperation, and respect for the rights of others and for public property. At the same time, it is very clear that the children most in need of socialization and discipline, as far as some reformers were concerned, could easily stay away from the playground since it was a voluntary institution. When school playgrounds were regularly supervised, the most unruly children always stayed away. The so-called loafers, street gamins, and gang leaders always found better things to do with their time than play in a pile of sand. When poorly supervised, playgrounds became a vehicle for chaos and disruption in local neighborhoods.

Isolated forms of dissent against school playgrounds surfaced in many cities. Newspaper editors occasionally likened them to new forms of state socialism, like penny lunches and vacation schools, which improperly relieved parents of their responsibilities for caring for their children. In 1908 the Rochester Federation of Catholic Societies, which correctly saw playgrounds, vacation schools, and social centers as closely related aspects of school extension, attacked all of the innovations as Socialistic, expensive, and conducive to mass pauperization.[73] More typical complaints were that poor children were unruly and could not be tamed. When the Children's Playground League of Rochester promoted a playground for Brown's Square, action was delayed for a year, until local residents were assured that the grounds would be supervised and would not become a haven for thugs and criminals. Civic clubs attached to neighborhood school social centers after 1907 repeatedly had to defend poor children, who were sometimes accused by other neighbors of low morals, vile habits, and disregard for private property. The playground at the No. 9 school in an Italian neighborhood was attacked by some fervent Catholics who disliked Sunday baseball games. They told the local alderman that "there was so much noise at the playground every Sunday that the peace of the neighborhood was disturbed."[74]

Republican newspaper editors in Toledo claimed that all play and no work was the underlying philosophy of the new education and that playgrounds would make Jack an "idle shirk."[75] Some teachers at the Erie School, located in an impoverished neighborhood North of downtown Toledo, feared in 1906 that a proposed playground there would only increase crime and become a hangout for "drunkards and toughs." Only after the Federation of Women's Clubs and the school board, which jointly sponsored the playground, assured them that there would be sufficient supervision were the teachers agreeable to the plan.[76] Exactly how much so-called vice and crime spread because of (or, conversely, was prevented by) local playgrounds is difficult to assess. More than once, however, Emil Seidel and Milwaukee's trade union leaders repudiated charges that "Nightly Orgies" abounded at the local playgrounds. From time to time local residents attacked the evening behavior of many immigrant and working-class children.[77]

In Milwaukee as elsewhere there were the usual problems of children breaking windows, trespassing on neighbor's lawns, and trampling vegetable patches while in search of that missing baseball. Some citizens occasionally complained that the local playgrounds were much too popular, teeming with children who reveled into the dark night. When neighbors chastized local children for their rudeness or questioned their activities, children often replied with "impertinent answers" and told them to mind their own business. And, in addition to these examples of how neighbors feared the proliferation of disorder on the school yards, there were also those who believed that the playgrounds would lessen their property value. A few delegations of citizens appeared before the school boards of different cities and opposed playgrounds in the interests of peace and tranquility, but they generally swam against the current of the times. Additional playgrounds, increased tax support for municipal recreation, and the continual expansion of school social services were characteristic of municipal reform movements of the Progressive era, even though a defiant minority of citizens realized that playgrounds were not necessarily a cure for the ills of the city street.

Like the vacation school an integral part of the new education, school playgrounds therefore had some contradictory results. Moreover, the majority of the city's children never had enough playgrounds at their disposal for their recreational use. This situation existed despite all the enthusiasm and work of dozens of voluntary groups that wanted to serve every child in their municipality. When the Children's Playground League assembled in 1903, it promised to labor until it found "a spot for every child in Rochester to play."[78] When the Children's Playground Association opened its second public playground before hundreds of appreciative residents, Golden Rule Jones told the audience, "when your children grow old, there will be hundreds of them. There will be playgrounds for everybody."[79] Numerous playground associations and civic groups elsewhere similarly believed that they would inaugurate a new era in public recreation, one which would satisfy the desires of all children for safe and organized play.

Playground enthusiasts never reached their desired ends. In the first place, insufficient money was a continual problem, both for voluntary groups and municipal school boards, which rountinely adopted additional playgrounds after the turn of the century. School enrollments increased rapidly, causing a shortage of funds at times for basic school construction. Playgrounds also competed with every other innovation for an appropriation. Moreover, class considerations greatly determined which neighborhoods received new playgrounds. Reformers argued that, as in the case of vacation schools, children in the most congested sections of town were most in need of organized play and more spots of green. This problem was further compounded by the fact that the areas most in need had the most children per acre but also the most expansive and scarce real estate. One observer noted that building a playground in particular neighborhoods might utilize land better used for more housing; the price of obtaining a playground was not only dear but its construction could possibly force rents higher than before.[80]

The class bias in school playground policy was extensive. Taxpayers agreed, for example, that the native elite on Milwaukee's East Side had larger homes, more spacious yards, and easier accessibility to the parks. The South Side, on the other hand, had smaller homes and yards and larger families, as well as less money for carfare for their children. Hence many local reformers, believing that more playgrounds would equalize opportunities for the poor, centered their efforts in the most congested, working-class areas. Such logic meant that the voluntary associations of Rochester placed their first playgrounds in the Italian and immigrant neighborhoods and at Brown's Square. Toledo's were placed in poorer areas near downtown and at the industrial East Side. And, in Kansas City, reformers tried to center their attention on the North End and the First Ward, the most crime ridden and poverty stricken areas in town. As previously noted, playground associations publicly called for playgrounds everywhere, for all children; privately they began their efforts in selected neighborhoods, making the playgrounds in part a form of municipal charity.

Gradually, however, playgrounds fanned out across the city, and many wealthier wards which had single dwelling housing with convenient yards also received more school playgrounds. In that way some of the class determinants of public play for children were eliminated. By 1912, Toledo had playgrounds for approximately one-third of its schools, Rochester had a slightly lower proportion, followed closely by Milwaukee and Kansas City. Comparative statistics on the number and public use of playgrounds are often misleading or notoriously difficult to assemble, since the information was gathered irregularly, calculated by different methods, and printed with conscious political intent. Reformers undoubtedly emphasized the bright side of school use, showing how well behaved the "hundreds" of children were on a particular afternoon. Everyone counted with particular goals in mind. When newspapers, for example, reported in 1902 that 15,000 children went on school excursions run by Toledo's City Federation of Women, they failed to explain who gathered the statistic, how many children participated one, two, or three times, whether there were limits on attendance, and whether the statistic was an estimate or scientifically determined.[81]

Information on the size of playgrounds from city to city and neighborhood to neighborhood is also difficult to collect and of limited value. More important, it is virtually impossible to state precisely which children of particular neighborhoods or sections of the city attended various playgrounds. Newspapers regularly noted that children would often travel from different districts to use a popular play spot, and one cannot presume that playgrounds in a predominately Italian neighborhood were only used by Italians. Rochesterians, it will be recalled, found all forms of "miniature humanity" at the No. 19 school: swarthy immigrants as well as gentile Americans. At the same time one cannot conclusively state what types of children attended the playgrounds. Certainly gang leaders, "street gamins," and other objects of reform would have often rejected the idea of supervised play, and those presumably most in the need of discipline and socialization as far as reformers were concerned probably slipped through the educational net.

If available statistics are unsatisfactory indicators of popular use, there are many other types of materials that illuminate the social role of playgrounds in different communities during the Progressive era. Numerous local studies, for example, were published near the end of the period that tried to assess the influence of different public amusements and recreational facilities on the quality of urban life. Quite clearly, contemporary playground enthusiasts realized that playgrounds, vacation schools, and social centers rarely competed effectively against the wide range of amusements and activities provided by private enterprise and the city street. In the battle between the street and the school, the street usually emerged victorious.

A special report sponsored by the Milwaukee City Club in 1914 discovered what everyone already knew; more children played on streets than on playgrounds. For this reason, the cover of the report had a photograph of a "street gamin" who, according to the caption, had "No Place to Play." Actually there were many places to play, but the playground was only one possible source of diversion and entertainment after the turn of the century. At best Milwaukee's playgrounds could handle perhaps one-third of the city's children between the ages of four and nineteen, and that assumed that 300 children could fit comfortably on every acre of playground space. At least two-thirds of the childhood population, therefore, played elsewhere. The expert in charge of a school board survey met many children who, when asked where they played, quickly responded: "We play in the alley, that's our yard."[82]

Children in Milwaukee had little danger of being unduly controlled by the playground. As in most cities, the poorer districts had smaller private yards in which to play but also proportionally fewer open spaces and school playgrounds for their childhood population. And there were many other sources of recreation besides the playground for every child with even a few cents to spend. The Milwaukee City Club survey estimated that although 32,000 children between four and nineteen were within a reasonable distance from a supervised playground, three-fourths of the total childhood population were not, so they "spend their playtime in streets, alleys, and vacant lots."[83] There were also pool halls, cheap theaters, dance halls, gangs, and many other sources of diversion with which the schools could never adequately compete and certainly never supplant. There was the "Avery Street Gang," which usually fought with the "Patrick Avenue Gang," or anyone else who stepped into their territory. And there was reportedly a colorful gang of seven year olds whose chief activity, according to its leader, was in "beatin' up de fellers on de next street."[84]

A massive survey of Kansas City's recreational resources by the Board of Public Welfare at the same time similarly found that playgrounds were a small aspect of public recreation for the majority of children. An examination of the Northwestern part of the city showed the situation at its worst extreme. This district included mostly the First Ward, near the bend in the Missouri River. With approximately 12,000 residents, mostly poor native whites and over a dozen foreign nationalities, the ward had one of the highest incidences of crime in Kansas City. Of the 1238 dwellings in the area, over half were inspected by the city for this survey. They included 48 lodging houses, 47 "bawdy" houses, and 203 tenement houses. About 4,000 homeless men at least roamed through the streets, comprising most of the potential tenants for the lodging houses. Some of the men, claimed one contemporary, included "capable workingmen displaced by industrial depressions, disturbances, or labor-saving inventions; all classes of casual or seasonal laborers between jobs; boys out on a lark or seeking their fortunes; the inefficient on account of sickness, age, and disability; victims of drug or strong drink; vagrants, beggars, and occasional strays from the ranks of professional criminals."[85]

The area had infamous gangs of blacks and foreign and native born residents, dozens of saloons, and for the nearly three thousand parochial and public school children--one playground. The playground competed with the largest number of commercial entertainments in all of Kansas City. These included 19 motion picture shows, 60 pool halls, 10 dance halls, 6 penny arcades, 4 shows for "men only," 2 "medical museums," and shooting galleries, bowling alleys, and theaters. In addition to these attractions, of course, there were countless activities for free on the city streets and alleys. Conditions were less extreme in other parts of Kansas City, but the Northwest area was where reformers tried to search for alternatives to street education and recreation provided by private enterprise--all with dismal results.[86]

To some degree the class stigma associated with playgrounds disappeared over time, since few people today regard municipal funds for recreation as solely desirable for the poor. But playgrounds and many other social services that were part and parcel of school extension were initially established primarily for the poorer classes, for immigrants as well as native born. A wide range of voluntary associations comprised of both men and women reformers fought numerous battles against the temptations and lures of the city street and made the first inroads into the area of public responsibility for organized play. The popularity of many of the playgrounds demonstrates that many parents endorsed this new alternative to the alley and street, preferring supervised play at the local school than their child's membership in groups like the Avery Street Gang or other youth groups. But the playgrounds, while an important example of school extension in the Progressive era, were only one of many alternative places of recreation, a single option compared to more exciting and alluring activities found on many city streets.

The Spirit of The Little Red School House

Good citizenship in a democracy is the consciousness and the practice not only of responsibility for obeying the government, but for participation in being the government.
Edward J. Ward, 1913

Two ideas are fighting for mastery in the educational world. One would make the schools into "efficient," card catalogued, time clocked, well bossed factories for the manufacture of wage slaves. The other would have the schools a part of our social life, specialized to hasten the development of children into free human beings. These two ideas clash from kindergarten to university.
Victor Berger, 1915

I

From the hot and dusty city streets, with their many lures and temptations, the story of school extension must shift to the more alluring shores of Lake Mendota on the University of Wisconsin campus. The year was 1911. In a large, fortress-like building known locally today as the Red Gym, hundreds of delegates from across the country assembled for a conference on one of the most fascinating and significant educational reforms of the early twentieth century: the social center. Sponsored by the University's famous extension division and inspired by Edward J. Ward, the reformer who made Rochester's social centers the showcase of the nation, the meeting attracted many distinguished visitors. Those in attendance included the new Socialist working-class mayor of Milwaukee, Emil Seidel; the next President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson; Kansas City's industrial relations expert, Frank P. Walsh; and the New York religious divine, Josiah Strong.

Delegates from rural and urban areas debated the fine points of the social center movement for several days. In the end, however, enough agreement was reached that a constitution was drafted and a new organization formed: the Social Center Association of America. "A spirit akin to the fervor of a great religious revival actuated the whole conference," wrote an observer in the Survey magazine. "It seemed to those present that America was at last about to develop a true democracy."[1] The spirit of the meetings was indeed intense, reaching a crescendo when several hundred people broke out into song on the final day:

> Come close and let us know the joy
> Our Fathers used to know,
> When to the little old schoolhouse
> Together they would go.
> Then neighbor's heart to neighbor warmed
> In thought for common good;
> We'll strike that fine old chord again--
> A song of neighborhood.[2]

The conference will never be remembered for its memorable song lyrics. Still, the meetings symbolized that the social center movement had reached national proportions. Cities like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City represented only a handful of the hundreds of communities across the nation that established these centers. Because of the rise of a popular, grass-roots movement for the wider use of the schools, the social center idea was endorsed by 1910 if for slightly different reasons by educators of the stature of John Dewey, G. Stanley Hall, and Charles W. Eliot. Later it was sanctioned by professional organizations like the N.E.A., the National Municipal League, the Playground and Recreation Association of America, and by political reformers like Robert M. LaFollette, Woodrow Wilson, and Theodore Roosevelt. The movement produced a national organization, a short-lived journal, and numerous informational bulletins funded by the U. S. Bureau of Education and the Russell Sage Foundation.[3] And, on the local level, educational reformers ranging from Socialist trade unionists to middle-class women's club activists fought for wider school use.

School extension and the idea of the wider use of the schools in the Progressive era found its greatest expression in the social center movement. The desire to utilize the schools for broader public purposes than in the past--through programs like vacation schools, playgrounds, and the use of the schools as meeting places--had actively stirred in the minds of many Americans since the years of social turmoil in the Nineties. After the turn of the century, many citizens struggled to make the schools more easily accessible for local residents. While the social backgrounds of school board members became more elite compared to previous years, and superintendents gained more control internally over decision making, numerous voluntary groups tried to counter these moves through their own movements for change from outside the system. Formally trained educators, of course, ultimately endorsed the establishment of social centers to different degrees. Yet the earliest thrust for the innovation came from the grass roots, from men and women who lacked power in policy decisions, who believed that control of the schools had drifted too far away from local neighborhoods, and who disliked the "better class" of individuals who regularly dominated on urban school boards.

Like many Progressive school innovations, the social center movement had complex origins and was supported by individuals representing a broad social and political spectrum. Nearly everyone, however, agreed that the idea of wider use had clear historical antecedents and was not merely a modern social invention. Some activists rooted the idea in the tradition of the colonial New England town meetings, others pointed to the previous successes of evening schools, lyceums, and chautauquas in educating the community, and more daring reformers believed that the Roman forum actually set the precedent for Progressive reform.[4] Although the concept of "efficiency" sometimes figured in the writings of Edward Ward, the leader of Rochester's social centers, he typically pitched his arguments to the character of his audiences: to businessmen, fuller use of the schools meant dollars and cents economy; to physicians, a way to curry favor in the neighborhood; to conservatives, a way to reduce delinquency by offering children alternatives to street gangs; to democrats, a free forum for public debate of timely subjects to increase civic intelligence and general knowledge.[5] Such eclectic arguments were common on the national and local levels and did more than simply mirror some corporate efficency ideology. Moreover, the parents and children who voluntarily attended the school centers possessed many different aims and motives of their own; their ideas did not necessarily coincide with the views of municipal officials, magazine writers, or even local educators.

Rural imagery was nevertheless common in the writings of social center advocates. Edward Ward, for example, occasionally made nostalgic appeals for the spirit of the little red school house. "The real ancestor of the public school social center is not the social settlement," Ward claimed in the Survey magazine in 1909, "but the little red schoolhouse back home, which, in the evenings, was used for a common meeting place for the neighborhood."[6] Ward, an ordained Presbyterian minister, had once worked with country folk in the village of Silver Creek, New York, where he absorbed an enduring sense of rural simplicity. A correspondent in the American Education in 1912 similarly invoked rural imagery in asserting that "the little red schoolhouse of our fathers and mothers' day with its spelling matches, singing schools, and Sunday services blazed the trail which was lost for a time but which recently has been rediscovered."[7]

To many observers, the supposed glories of the rural past did not adequately explain the nation's current fascination with social centers. An Anglophile like Woodrow Wilson, for example, saw the centers as a manifestation of our Teutonic flair for organization and representative government. The editor of the Independent in 1902 heartily agreed, believing that the school would be the focus of the neighborhood just like the town meeting of old New England.[8] Others more commonly believed that the movement was a response to the isolation of urban life and the deprivations caused by advanced stages of industrial growth, with its ill effects on family life, income distribution, and general social welfare. "The root of the movement lies deep down in the growing realization that those upon whom falls the heat and burden of the day have a right to more than mere existence," claimed a spokesman of this view in the American Review of Reviews.[9]

Surprisingly few advocates of the social centers argued that they were trying to reestablish a form of community life that once existed in the city. Ward, for example, had lived in cities as well as in rural areas but evinced little personal understanding of what type of "community" life existed in these schools before the late nineteenth century, when the ward system of school governance gave way to smaller boards elected at large. Although more research is needed in this area, the leaders of the ward system were not especially enthusiastic about the use of schools for various community meetings; democratic localism through machine politics may have served many functions but easy access to schools was never one of them.

The rules and regulations of many urban school systems in the nineteenth century expressly forbade the community use of the schools. Whether that was due primarily to the architecture of the average school, which was designed for children rather than adults, or for more complex reasons remains a central issue. Certainly many civic organizations, including various women's clubs, labor groups, and radical third parties had to work diligently in the 1890s to open the schools for wider use. Late nineteenth-century urban school systems permitted school use for graduation exercises and special occasions, but regular and routine use was uncommon. Rule 32 of the Milwaukee school board in the 1860s remained in force for a long time, however shortsighted and narrow it seemed to a later generation of Progressives:

> Scholars shall not assemble about the school building exceeding thirty minutes before school, and then they must enter their respective rooms, take their seats, and pursue their studies... NO PLAYING MUST EVER BE ALLOWED IN THE SCHOOL BUILDING.[10]

Such a rule was hardly conducive to social center work, but it was found in Rochester, Toledo, Kansas City, and many American cities.

Strictures against parental and adult use were common and lapses from such rules usually temporary. One type of exception was in Toledo. In the 1860s General Hill convinced his peers on the school board to permit high school cadets to use the schools for military drills. Teachers were also occasionally allowed to use the schools for free in the summer, so they could operate "select" schools to supplement their meager incomes.[11] In the 1840s the Rochester schools, later the preeminent leader in the social center movement, went even further by allowing religious services in the local schools on weekends due to a shortage of available buildings. Neighborhood use, however, was short-lived when other segments of the community demanded the separation of church and state; for various reasons the schools were then sealed from religious as well as non-religious groups for several decades.[12]

Clarence Perry, the efficiency expert of the Russell Sage Foundation who rivaled Edward Ward as a major promoter of wider use, aptly described this state of affairs:

> The children who went to school back in the eighties skipped out of the school house door at half past three and scampered down the street shouting with glee. Instruction was finished for the

> day and the building turned over to the janitor for sweeping.[13]

Beginning primarily in the 1890s in response to many-sided grassroots' demands for the broader use of the schools, this narrower conception of education slowly changed. The quality and extensiveness of new evening schools, recreational programs, and social centers varied from city to city. As in the case of vacation schools and playgrounds, the realities of the social centers often fell far below many people's expectations. Still, the social center movement--whether it was called school extension, school socialization, the Rochester movement, or the wider use of the school plant--was a dominant concern of professional and community groups interested in educational policy in the early twentieth century.

II

Urban social centers had their roots less in the rural past than in the behavior of women's and parental organizations that increasingly predominated in school reform in many urban communities in the late nineteenth century. Edward Ward and many Progressives were especially conscious of this aspect of urban reform. "Wherever, as at many of the schools of Rochester, there is a flourishing Parent-Teachers' Association," Ward believed, there was also "the germ of the development of a Social Center."[14] Perhaps the most important and earliest forces behind the wider use of the schools were indeed the mothers' unions and Parent-Teacher Associations that first permanently organized in American cities in the 1890s; these local agencies for reform became nationally powerful with the formation of the National Congress of Mothers in 1897.[15] By actively supporting innovative educational programs and social services in the schools, they helped break down the isolation of institutions whose increasingly professionalized and centralized nature threatened to drive them far away from the life of the average citizen. Vacation schools, playgrounds, social centers, school lunches, domestic science and manual training programs, as well as other innovations, received much of their impetus and strength from these organizations. Indeed, this effort by voluntary groups to restructure education upon a foundation of activity, experimentation, and social welfare reflected changing popular perceptions of the social functions of the urban schools and constituted a forgotten grass-roots expression of Progressive Education.

Women's club members in the 1890s found that their own parlours were ill suited for their meetings, especially when their organizations grew to several hundred members. As a result they turned to one of the most convenient and central institutions in their neighborhood: the local school. By the late 1890s, women's organizations had successfully convinced ward leaders to permit them to meet in various neighborhood schools, usually on a weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly basis. This was true of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, the Women's Educational Club and affiliates of the City Federation of Women's Clubs in Toledo, the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee, and the Athenaeum of Kansas City. By opening the schools to these women's associations, school officials unknowingly helped propel a movement for even wider use of the neighborhood schools.

In addition to women's groups, which contained mothers as well as some single and childless women, the next important catalysts of wider use in the Nineties were mothers' unions and newly-formed parent organizations. Compared with the immediate post-Civil War decades, the years from the depression of the 1890s to World War I witnessed the rapid formation of parent organizations. With the elimination of ward representation in the schools came an increased emphasis on community participation. Ephemeral local groups had organized for educational purposes in the nineteenth century, but the emerging public enthusiasm for the idea at the turn of the century impressed many contemporary writers. "The Parents' Association," wrote a University of Chicago professor in 1908, "seems to be a veritable exception to the general statement that 'there is nothing new under the sun.'"[16] Several years later, Mary Beard, the social activist, noted that "today there exists an incredible number of organizations whose main aim is cooperation with the schools in one way or another." And, she perceptively noted, "a study of these organizations and their aims justifies the belief that many of the very best features of the present educational system owe their existence to private suggestion and assistance and experimentation."[17]

Cooperation, of course, had been a nominal goal of the original common school movement. It will be recalled that in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City, a wide range of professional educators, school board members, and other citizens urged parents to meet more regularly with the teaching staff and to applaud the work of the new school systems. Once again in the 1890s, there began a new effort for cooperation between home and school, one which produced tangible results. Women not only met in the schools, but they also actively endorsed the formation of neighborhood mothers' unions and parent organizations whenever possible. Prominent clubwomen and school activists like Helen B. Montgomery of Rochester, Pauline Steinem of Toledo, Lizzie Kander of Milwaukee, and Ruth Weeks of Kansas City all aggressively promoted greater cooperation between the home and the school and greater organizational activities to reach that end.

Similarly, all of the prominent female social welfare organizations in these cities devoted part of their energies in the Nineties to parent associations. Urging more frequent visits by parents to local schools, a subcommittee of the education division of the Women's Union in Rochester believed in 1897 that this would help citizens "become fully acquainted with our school system and to bring about a closer, more friendly relation between teacher and patron."[18] Helen Montgomery claimed that parent organizations fostered that "intelligent cooperation" between home and school that would "bring to bear on the child the strongest possible influence for good."[19] Her counterpart in Toledo, Pauline Steinem, argued that parents should not be timid when meeting with teachers, who in turn "should feel that they are as much directly responsible to the parents as to anyone."[20] In Milwaukee, the Woman's School Alliance claimed that the creation of "intimate and cordial relations between teachers and parents" was a prerequisite to all educational progress.[21] Since so many of the members of women's clubs were mothers as well as former teachers, they had stood on both sides of the bridge which usually separated home and school. The parent-teacher organization seemed like the ideal way to connect parents and teachers in the best interests of the child.

While local women's clubs began to popularize parent-teacher associations in the 1890s, kindergarten teachers also eagerly endorsed the need for regular interaction between home and school. In that way they also contributed to the wider use of the schools and, ultimately, the social center. Kindergarten teachers continually promoted the establishment of mothers' clubs. Inspired by the writings of Frederich Froebel, who desired an almost mystical unity of mankind, these teachers formed many of the nation's first permanent mothers' clubs in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, Kansas City, and other places. The main thrust of professional teachers' organizations in the Progressive Era was job security and economic well-being, but kindergarten teachers above all remained leading PTA enthusiasts in the early twentieth century. They had expanded upon Froebel's call--"Come, let us live with our children"--to include parents as well.[22]

The nation's kindergarten teachers were often employed in the late nineteenth century in the poorest, immigrant-populated sections of the American city. In Rochester, however, the first of a series of mothers' meetings sponsored by a kindergarten teacher met at the No. 14 school, a middle-class residential area east of downtown. As the Democrat and Chronicle noted in 1896, "these meetings are for the purpose of bringing the teachers and mothers of children together for a better understanding of the work" of the schools.[23] Much of the success of mothers' unions, as well as parent organizations which often evolved out of them, depended on the mutual respect of teachers and parents. Miss Adele Brooks, a kindergartner who was locally known as "the mother of Mother's Clubs" for her central role in organizing them, effectively worked with clubwomen and others until mothers' unions formed at nearly every Rochester school after the turn of the century. By then, an annual mass meeting of several thousand mothers met every June, in addition to the monthly meetings held by local organizations. Brooks effectively organized people from very different social backgrounds. "Poor mothers, rich mothers, old mothers, young mothers, white mothers, and black mothers attended the mass meeting" in 1901, according to the Union and Advertiser.[24] Little wonder, then, that one observer in 1905 asserted that the mothers' unions were "in a flourishing condition."[25]

In Toledo, a number of parent groups also flourished by the early twentieth century. Foremost among these was the Golden Rule Mothers' Club, which met at Golden Rule Hall and was energized by the Christian Socialism of Samuel M. Jones. Occasionally a sympathetic newspaper editor would also encourage more parental organizations. "Let's get the parents of Toledo organized and interested in the schools," editorialized the Evening Bee, which supported Complete Education though not all of the political ideas of Golden Rule Jones. "Let's see if we can't do something to make the schools so pleasant that children will be eager to attend them."[26] And, as always, parents and teachers who banded together emphasized the benefits of cooperation. The Newberry School Club, formed in 1898, typically emphasized the importance of meeting teachers on a common ground and added that the school association was "the best way to promote the interests of their children."[27]

During her tenure on the Toledo school board between 1905 and 1909, Pauline Steinem took an active interest in community and parental organization. Earlier she had joined other grassroot Progressives to restore partial district representation on the school board, and now she personally held parent rallies in nearly every district school. Steinem also held weekly receptions for parents, who came and talked and criticized every conceivable educational idea with her and with teachers every Wednesday. Steinem believed that these meetings and parent organizations promised to "give the teachers a better insight into the character of the pupils, and the parents an unprejudiced opinion of the teachers."[28] By 1910, one Toledo principal remarked that although "there was a time when parents seldom entered a schoolhouse except when they were angry and went there to scold...we are getting away from that very rapidly."[29] Within two years, a Cooperative Parents' Club assembled that united the numerous individual organizations. Its aims were threefold: "the betterment of Toledo schools, the use of the public school buildings for all purposes of an educational nature, and a more active co-operation between parents, teachers, and school officials."[30]

In both Milwaukee and Kansas City, mothers' unions and parent associations similarly gained access to the schools for their meetings and thereby laid the basis for their wider use. In the working-class Jones' Island neighborhood in Milwaukee in 1897, Principal Mary F. Flanders and kindergarten teachers organized poor German and Polish mothers "in order to awaken the interest of parents in the work which the schools are doing."[31] The Sentinel reported that the meetings were well attended and profited both home and school. In Kansas City as in many cities, kindergartners again took the first steps in the formation of mothers' unions during the depression of the Nineties, and by 1901 the Daily Journal wrote that "scarcely a month passes without the organization of some new union."[32] Superintendent James M. Greenwood gloated two years later that on the newly established "Patron's Day," "it is not an uncommon thing for three or four hundred parents to visit one of the ward schools and familiarize themselves with the working of the school which their children attend."[33] As a result of this flurry of activity, Kansas City's Parent-Teacher Associations, an outgrowth of these mothers' unions, had the largest parental organization in the world in 1919.

For cities like Rochester, Toledo, and Milwaukee, where local representation on the school board had suffered a decisive setback during the Progressive era, parent organizations provided at least one mechanism by which neighborhoods united to promote their interests. In Toledo, for example, parent associations through World War I actively lobbied for new and improved school facilities as well as for various social welfare programs. After 1910 in particular, when a rural-controlled state legislature passed the Smith Law, numerous parent organizations routinely appeared at the school board meetings and demanded new facilities and improvements for local neighborhoods.[34]

The Smith Law placed spending limits on Ohio cities to the extent that school construction lagged far behind rising student populations. Very often, the most persistent parental lobbyists locally received new schools. In 1913, an indefatigable Ironville delegation from the working-class East Side, as well as many other parents, petitioned for and received notable building improvements for their schools on account of their persistence.[35] In a place like Kansas City, where elite control of education had become engrained in its history, parent organizations probably brought the local schools and teachers into closer affiliation with parents and children. The often impersonal ways of the administration were not altered by new parents' groups, but mothers and fathers continued to work on the outside of the system for local and city-wide educational improvements.

Parent groups in these four cities engaged in various activities in the Progressive era. Their aim was to better home relationships with teachers and to make the schools more serviceable to the community. On different occasions they championed along with other civic groups the inauguration of penny lunches, playgrounds, school gardens, medical and dental inspection, free eyeglasses for children, better sanitary conditions, and any number of improvements. Most important, they well contributed to the civic activism of the period. Not content to let the schools drift further away from their control, many parent organizations tried to draw the schools closer to local neighborhoods. In the process, they notably contributed to the idea of wider school use and ultimately the conversion of neighborhood institutions into social centers. In reaction to many of the centralizing features of the age, parents and other grass-roots forces fought for innovations which might establish what local cities had never really known: the spirit of the little red schoolhouse which, as the song said, "our fathers used to know."

III

As many new social services and programs entered the public schools after the turn of the century, many reformers soon endorsed the establishment of "social centers" in neighborhood schools. It was a simple step from the centering of many innovations in the school to the larger belief that the school was in fact the center of the community, a centripetal force around which numerous and varied social activities quite naturally gathered. By 1904, Rochester's new school superintendent learned that every grammar school with an assembly hall was a growing center of community activities. The halls, he wrote, "are in constant use and become the centre of the life of the school. They are used as assembly rooms; for classes in music and gymnastics and free games."[36] Mothers' unions, too, congregated there in the evenings to discuss educational topics with the teachers.

In many ways it is easier to appraise the degree to which specific programs like vacation schools, playgrounds, or penny lunches entered the schools than to assess how often schools became genuine "social centers." To many people, the idea conjured up such notions as the use of the schools as reading rooms, branch libraries, gyms, meeting places, polling places, and all forms of extension. But it is impossible to say exactly when enough programs existed simultaneously to conclude that the schools were in reality functioning as a social center in the neighborhood. Did it occur, for example, simply when parent or women's groups gained access to the schools for their meetings in the 1890s? How many programs constituted a true center?

Even though playground activities varied as well as the curriculum for vacation schools and the items on the school luncheon menu, most contemporaries could agree on how to distinguish these innovations from each other. The "social center," however, was usually a shorthand expression for a hodgepodge of different programs or cluster of ideas than a single entity. As Edward A.

Krug has written in The Shaping of the American High School, the delegates at the national social center conference held in Madison in 1911 vigorously quarreled over what constituted a social center, and when it could be said that a school had become one. No two people, he noted, could totally agree on a definition for the social center.[37]

Krug's position was verified in a statement by Carroll G. Pearse, the superintendent of the Milwaukee schools. In his Annual Report in 1909, Pearse endorsed easier access for many citizens and associations to the local schools yet noted:

> Different cities are working out the Social Center idea along different lines; some in one direction, some in another. The term Social Center does not as yet mean any one thing; no "type" has been developed. But by experiment and comparison, we shall gradually work out a standard plan, as we have for the common and high schools.[38]

One could count playgrounds, vacation schools, and penny lunches. It was much more difficult to estimate how often or whether schools became social centers.

The lack of precision in the phrase "social center" does not preclude making estimates on the effects of wider use in education, as long as one carefully observes the different meanings it sometimes had in various contexts. For most people, social center meant the after-hours use of the schools in several nontraditional areas for children and adults. Since nearly every school house in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City was regularly used as meeting places for mothers' unions, parent associations, and women's clubs after the Nineties, they were all in a sense social centers. At the same time, some schools placed more emphasis on evening recreational programs for the community; others, like the Rochester centers during their formative years, became nationally renowned because of the innovative conceptions of Edward J. Ward. Rochester's centers were like no other ones in the nation.

The distinctive quality of social center development in Rochester especially captured the nation's attention between 1907 and 1911. "There is hardly a city in the United States but what is unfamiliar with the work of the Rochester social centers," claimed an author in *The Playground* magazine in 1910.[39] Indeed, Blake McKelvey, Rochester's esteemed historian, has written that Rochester's social center experiment was perhaps the city's most original contribution to social welfare in the Progressive era.[40] Under the leadership of Edward J. Ward, the city enjoyed national recognition. The successes of the centers were described in lay periodicals like the *Outlook* and *Independent*, in professional magazines like *American Education*, the *Journal of Education*, and the *American School Board Journal*, and in welfare journals like the *Child-Welfare Magazine*, *Survey*, and *Charities and Correction*. Progressives like Judge Ben Lindsey, Lincoln Steffens, and Brand Whitlock gave Ward's experiments unqualified praise and helped publicize them across the United States.

Rochester's social centers were not significant because they were the first ones established in the United States. So-called social centers had operated in several cities for a few years before the Rochester plan was approved by the city council and the board of education in 1907. Even the circumstances surrounding social center development in Rochester were especially noteworthy, since numerous centers across the nation owed their existence to the spirit of cooperation that often united civic organizations. Yet the circumstances certainly seemed unique and dramatic to the people of this city. Over a decade of civic struggle in Rochester for various social and school reforms culminated in 1907 with the creation of a School Extension Committee. "The Board of Education had absolutely nothing to do with the organization of this movement," claimed the President of the school board in 1910, when he was attacked from many sides for the centers' allegedly unAmerican activities.[41]

President Forbes was a professor at the University of Rochester, a Good Government leader, and a supporter of Edward J. Ward and the social centers. He was also correct in his historical analysis, for the demand for social centers came not from within the schools but from specific community groups. The School

Extension Committee represented diverse segments of the community and claimed to represent the views of fifty thousand citizens. The eleven organizations that comprised the group were hardly a monolithic lot, for they included the Playground League, the College Women's Club, the D.A.R., the Local Council of Women, the Officers' Association of the Mothers' Club, the Political Equality Club, the Social Settlement Association, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, the Humane Society, the Central Trades and Labor Council, and the Labor Lyceum, who were better known locally as the Socialists. Social Gospel ministers also aided the cause.[42]

The Labor Journal summed up the local feeling when it simply wrote: "The schools should be the people's clubs. The city's money is the people's money."[43] This general display of civic cooperation between grass-roots forces that had first gained public recognition after the depression of the Nineties was in many ways a culmination of over a decade of reform efforts in Rochester. Under the new centralized school board, which took power in 1900 through the combined support of Good Government leaders and Boss Aldridge, the first decade of the twentieth century witnessed more school reforms than any other comparable period in the city's educational history. Under the leadership of Susan B. Anthony and other Progressive women in the Nineties, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union locked horns with the ward leaders on the unreformed school board and agitated for sewing classes, domestic science programs, vacation schools, penny lunches, and other innovations. After the turn of the century they joined community interest groups like the Children's Playground League and the Central Trades and Labor Council in initiating similar types of service programs. This heightened concern with the welfare of the city schools produced the February, 1907, meeting that produced the social center proposal. Under continued pressure from these groups, the city council and board of estimate steadily increased the social center budget from 1907 to 1910, though it is clear from hindsight that Boss Aldridge's political influence made the centers extremely vulnerable.[44]

If the Rochester centers, like those elsewhere, were the product of voluntary group pressure and the culmination of previous reform efforts, their operations were nevertheless quite distinctive compared to other cities. Most of the differences between the Rochester centers and those elsewhere resulted from the efforts of Edward J. Ward, who was the social center supervisor between 1907 and 1910. Among recent "revisionist" historians, Joel Spring in particular has condemned the social center movement and the philosophy of Ward. Spring contends that Ward was a typical Progressive elitist who tried to establish community relations within a framework of corporate capitalism. Ward was anti-democratic, corporate-oriented, and technocratic; like the views of his peers, his paternalistic philosophy dictated that the "better" people should rule.[45] Similarly, another historian views Ward as an advocate of social engineering, a rural romantic, and a proponent of moral uplift. Ward and fellow Rochester Progressives, he argues, worked to undermine democratic values and eliminate Socialist alternatives to the social order.[46]

These critics of the social center movement are correct on one point: the extent to which the broader use of schools was generally promoted through the use of factory metaphors. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard helped set the tone for future discussions of wider use when he argued that the underutilization of the school plant violated the principle of business efficiency. "It is obvious at a glance that so partial a use of an industrial plant would never be thought possible" by a businessman. "No productive industry could be successfully carried on with so incomplete a use of an expensive plant."[47] School plant became synonymous with school house, and factory metaphors were employed in many school reports, popular magazines, and books that discussed the value of community extension.

"When the public pays for schools, it pays for institutions that lie...in profitless idleness eighteen hours out of every twenty four," claimed an author in World's Work in 1903. The schools are "fenced in bugbears, in cities at all events, shunned by the children for whom they have been erected, a waste of investment that private capital would not tolerate for a moment."[48] "No sensible manufacturer would sanction such a policy in the management of an extensive plant," agreed an educator in a professional journal.[49] Clarence Perry, who carefully gathered statistics for the Sage Foundation and the U. S. Bureau of Education, wrote in the American City in 1910 that businessmen on school boards were finally "beginning to see that the utilization of the expensive school plant less than half the time...does not jibe with the policy followed in their places of business."[50]

Stanley Schultz and other writers have demonstrated that factory metaphors were liberally used by educators in the nineteenth century. During the efficiency movement of the Progressive era, they often became irresistible to many policy makers and educators. Efficiency, however, was only one of the many arguments writers used to evoke a favorable impression on wider use. Settlement workers in New York and Chicago were often swamped with requests from groups like unions and socialists who lacked meeting places, indicating a rising public demand from below for community use noticed by various social observers.[51] Writers in magazines from Charities to The Playground, while endorsing economic efficiency arguments, commonly presented a wide range of justifications to secure results--from the need for more democracy, for more citizenship training, and for wholesome places where different types of citizens could meet on a common ground. Superintendent William Maxwell of New York City, for example, believed that more than economic efficiency was at stake, for when schools were closed in the evenings and summer months, it was "not only to waste the peoples' money, but to deprive the benefits of [their use to] many thousands of persons of all ages who might otherwise take advantage of them."[52]

While historians have popularly labelled Ward as an efficiency Progressive, this famous social center advocate could tell the difference between pig-iron and people and between the narrow and broad methods of argumentation. In studying his widely-read volume, The Social Center (1914), as well as other writings, one is impressed not by the occasional interjection of words like efficiency in the analysis but by his broadly conceived views on education and numerous justifications for wider use. Writing in the American City in 1914, Ward pointed out in fact that arguments on economic efficiency constituted the "least" important reasons for community centers; more important in his writings were family and home metaphors, since he wanted to connect the primary bonds of familial association to the entire neighborhood through the local schools.[53] In The Social Center he entitled one chapter "Like Home" (not "Like a Factory"), where he called for a greater use of the schools by neighborhood families and citizens to discuss significant social issues and to make them a "homelike institution."[54]

Details of Ward's social philosophy that might present him in a more favorable light to modern readers have been systematically omitted in recent histories. For example, pacifists might be drawn to his belief in social cooperation and arbitration as a legitimate consideration in an interdependent world; historians of academic freedom might be interested in the circumstances surrounding his dismissal from a college teaching post for his allegedly radical views; women's rights advocates might be concerned with his full support for equal voting privileges for women; and critics of the competition spawned by a capitalist social structure might perceive in his writings more than some narrow efficiency rationale.

Ward believed that modern society was based on the laws "of the brute--pretense, suspicions, fear, deception, exploitation, dog-eat-dog, caveat emptor."[55] In condemning self-centered individualism and the abuse of public rights by private corporations and the stranglehold of "political and economic bosses" over the citizenry, Ward exhibited that sense of moral outrage typically shared by many local Progressives. Undoubtedly these various aspects of his social thinking caused this Social Gospel minister to leave the clergy, to join the Socialist Party as a young man, and to seek other avenues of public service.[56] To simply describe him as an efficiency expert is to force his ideas and behavior into an ill-fitting straight jacket.

Despite current historical appraisals, Ward was in the context of his times fairly democratic in his perspectives. After being hired by the Rochester school board as social center director in 1907, he proceeded to employ his novel ideas in formulating public policy. In many cities, the community use of the schools was based on a philosophy of social uplift, which meant that the poorest neighborhoods (often ones also targeted for vacation schools and playgrounds) first received the social centers. Ward, however, aimed to establish the centers without any hint of class, ethnic, or racial bias. Contrary to the claims of recent writers, he was deeply critical of social uplift theories that were specifically aimed at the poor. In a general sense Ward believed that social centers "uplifted" the community by spreading democratic ideals. He accepted the belief that poor people "need the wholesome entertainment, the opportunities for physical and literary culture, and the inspiration which comes through club association."[57] But poor people were not the only individuals who could benefit from the wider use of the schools: all people could profit from the social centers. Ward emphasized that "the Social Center, according to the Rochester idea, is not a municipal substitute for a social settlement. There is no taint of 'charity,' no paternalistic spirit of philanthropy about it."[58]

Ward firmly believed that the social centers as he conceived them promoted good citizenship, but citizenship training was a participatory process, not something the better class of people or the schools did to others. Ward believed that charity organizations were condescending in their treatment of the poor, and he did not want the social centers in Rochester to suffer from "the stigma of class service" or become "a sort of municipal charity institution."[59] For that reason Ward established the first center at the No. 14 school, located in a middle-class area, before additional centers spread out across the other sections of the city. As he argued in the Survey magazine, every city should establish its first center in a "relatively well-to-do neighborhood" and not in a section where one paternatistically attempted to "uplift the submerged, the poor."[60]

The Rochester centers were also distinctive because they followed Ward's plan of emphasizing adult civic clubs over community recreational activities that were common elsewhere. This was the heart of the Rochester social center movement and what made Ward's contributions to schooling and to democratic theory so engaging. Historians who have argued that these clubs were similar to the high school civics classes generations of Americans have suffered through greatly exaggerate the comparison.[61] Ward gave wide latitude to the adult clubs in terms of self-government, a position that was strongly opposed by some members of the school administration. Ward claimed in the Independent in 1909 that "from the beginning there has been absolutely no limitation upon freedom of discussion, and the clubs have uniformly shown a desire to have every question fairly presented from both sides."[62] Historians who condemn Ward as a "social engineer" greatly underemphasize how his reluctance to interfere with the internal operations of the clubs helped destroy his local experiment.

The only requirement that Ward levied on the adult civic clubs was that everyone in the city could join them and that everyone must have a chance to participate in the meetings. The meetings must not simply be non-exclusive in character, he argued, they must positively be "all-inclusive." School superintendent Herbert Weet later reminisced in a history of the centers that Ward's extreme views were simply unacceptable. The adult clubs, Weet complained, were "self-directing organizations. The only restriction placed upon them was that they could not be partisan or exclusive either in meetings or discussion. Any adult, therefore, was eligible to attend and to participate with discussions, subject only to such rules as the club itself might see fit to make." As a result, he continued, these clubs "had in them a full quota of extremists for one cause or another." Anarchist and Socialist "extremists" would monopolize discussions, spread their heretical though false doctrines, and "give expression to extravagent and poorly timed views on public questions. These things are, of course, inherent in the open forum."[63]

Weet disliked open, unrestricted discussions, and he surely exaggerated the radicalism of local social center participants. Yet Weet understood that the relatively autonomous position of the adult clubs was the novelty of the Rochester experiment. Ward likened social center directors to hired clerks: they scheduled meetings, contacted potential speakers, and helped organize various affairs. In his writings he repeatedly argued that it was absurd for either social center employees or school board members to tell adults and taxpayers what subjects to discuss and how to analyze them at their meetings. Addressing the N.E.A. in 1912, Ward asserted that the social center director and "his assistants in the various neighborhoods are not teachers, but servants of these neighborhood civic clubs, aiding in the preparation of programs, the work of publicity, and otherwise serving the owners of the building."[64] Good citizenship in a democracy meant not simply obeying laws and voting but fully participating in the formulation of public policy through debates and citizen interaction.

Ward's support for free speech and for autonomous adult participation was widely applauded by Progressive members of the school board and the various community groups that were responsible for the Rochester movement. Under his guidance the social centers and civic clubs evolved in representative parts of the city along with the establishment of vacation schools and playgrounds for children. Within two years the civic clubs grew from a single club to sixteen clubs with 1,500 members; a League of Civic Clubs united these diverse groups to press for increased appropriations for the centers. Besides men's and women's civic clubs, junior clubs of adolescent girls and boys were formed. These clubs usually met on alternate weekday evenings, free of charge, followed by a general neighborhood meeting of all interested people on Saturday night.[65]

Ward's desire that the civic organizations should be all-inclusive groups was fulfilled, since the adult civic clubs were often highly representative of Rochester's class, ethnic, ideological, and racial interests. Besides Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and atheists, organized labor and business representatives often served on the steering committees of the local clubs. While Kansas City in particular followed the color line in its "community" centers, the Rochester clubs were racially integrated and prominently publicized as such in social center publications.[66] The centers gained a reputation locally for radicalism and intense criticism of various municipal policies, and they were reportedly utilized by "people of all creeds, parties, and incomes." Italians and Swedes predominated in a few of the civic clubs, reflecting the local ethnic makeup of their neighborhood, as many different segments of Rochester found value in the concept of wider use.[67]

Free speech, debate, and interaction were the heartbeat of the adult clubs. Socialists argued with capitalists, atheists critiqued the church, and the Turnverein countered the charges of the Prohibitionist Party candidates. A broad range of subjects that affected the life of the average citizen captured the attention of participants. During the first year, for example, speakers discussed the "Duties of an Alderman," "Rochester's Milk," "Trusts," the "Tax Levy," "Socialist Policies," and the "Proglems of This Community." Increasingly the city boss looked suspiciously upon such discussions, which were often decidedly critical of his power and policies. By 1908, the chief Aldridge organ, the Rochester Times, began to popularize the notion that Socialists controlled the centers and threatened public order and morality. While careful not to condemn the idea of wider use in theory, the editor condemned the fact that "citizens other than Socialists" permitted them to "have the right of way" in discussions. Unless a "representative audience" regularly attended the centers, "persons whom we call cranks and faddists form the majority and crowd others aside."[68] When that occurred the centers should be closed.

Within the next several months the city's five major newspapers followed the lead of the Times and demanded the end of the centers or at least a radical departure from past politics, namely, the firing of Ward, the purging of Socialist influence, and the end of free speech for adults. The pretext for the dissolution of the Rochester experiment was provided not by Ward as much as by the actions of his friend, Kendrick Shedd, a University of Rochester professor who was the director of the No. 9 center. Shedd, who was later fired from the University for his radical views, was also the director of the Rochester Socialist Sunday Schools and the Young People's Socialist League. An extremely popular speaker, he had once lectured to the Labor Lyceum on the fallacies of Socialism but somehow became attracted to it before 1910.[69]

In many respects the entire fate of the local movement publicly hinged on the No. 9 center, which had a reputation for radicalism because of Shedd's presence and the school's location in an immigrant neighborhood. One Sunday afternoon in 1909, Shedd sponsored a masquerade ball in which children reportedly dressed in costumes of the opposite sex. This activity caused a furor in the city. Catholic priests and various Protestants in the Minister's Association condemned the desecration of the Sabbath and hinted at sexual permissiveness that was headlined in the local newspapers. The speeches of any radicals or Socialists who talked at the centers were increasingly dramatized in the press, while milder discussions were often ignored. Conditions ripened for Boss Aldridge, who could point to these criticisms as just cause for the end of the experiment. The Times denounced the centers as the "hotbeds of Socialists" and the home of "Ferrerists, Socialists, Anarchists, and other ists"; the Post Express claimed that "Mr. Ward's organization is a sort of socialist hatchery supported at the expense of the taxpayers"; and the Union and Advertiser called the centers "a fungus growth on the school system that should be got rid of."[70]

Ward and Shedd tried to undermine mounting criticism by pointing to the innocence of the masquerade ball. New rumors, however, surfaced whenever Ward was out of the city on short trips. At one point Ward's greatest clerical opponent, Father A. M. O'Neill (who called the centers Socialist centers) attacked the clubs for increasing class, ethnic, and religious conflict in the city through the policy of unregulated discussions; he also accused Ward in the Immaculate Conception Magazine of falsifying his statistical reports to prove that the centers were popular. Then a minister reported that Ward, who had left the church, had approvingly written that the modern churches were dead and would ultimately be replaced by the social centers. Ward denied this charge and pointed out that the churches were limited as a community force because they were denominational institutions while the centers were for everyone in the community.[71] The Herald swam with the tide and assailed Ward's policy of permitting "unregulated and irresponsible utterances" at the centers.[72] Ward again was forced to respond, affirming the right of free speech for all citizens. Whether or not he agreed with a speaker's viewpoint, Ward argued, was immaterial, as long as everyone had a chance to express their beliefs at the school house meetings. Adults in a democracy were capable of making up their own minds on public issues.

Letters to the editor and editorials on the social center controversy filled the local newspapers in late 1909 and early 1910. The Shedd incident, the O'Neill accusations, and the Ward rebuttals made tremendous news stories. Since the center appropiation for the next year would be determined in February, 1910, delegations of citizens flooded the mayor's office with resolutions and personal appeals. The Union and Advertiser helped insure that the debates would be heated when, in a joint effort with the other newspapers to throttle the local movement, it called Ward a radical and his associates a "motley array of Socialists, free thinkers, and apostles of discontent."[73] Ward's admission to critics that he was indeed a Christian Socialist only inflamed local debate, for it was now more forcefully asserted that "the social center idea as advocated by Mr. Ward and his friends is the thin edge of the socialistic wedge."[74] The No. 9

civic club reaffirmed its commitment to free speech if not Shedd's political views and further intensified the debate, claiming that "Our movement has been started upon the proper basis--Free Discussion. Anything short of that spells failure."[75]

The community groups that had initially supported the Rochester experiment did not desert the cause. Women's club members marched on city hall. So did the delegates of the Central Trades and Labor Council, which "unanimously" passed a resolution favoring full funding for the centers. They were joined by the Turnverein, settlement workers, mothers' clubs, P.T.A.'s, and other associations that lobbied in vain for the survival of free speech and adult use of the schools.[76] The centers, which had gained a national reputation, were all but eliminated by the city boss, who used Catholic opposition and major editorials from the press as proof of the unpopularity of the local innovation. Ward and his associates were dismissed, to the regret of Progressive community groups and reform-oriented members of the school board. Rochester's centers after 1910 were almost indistinguishable from those in many parts of the nation, as they increasingly emphasized recreational programs to the virtual exclusion of adult civic participation. By the summer of 1910, Ward left Rochester for Wisconsin, where he became a state organizer of social centers in the extension division of the state university at Madison. Ward viewed the failure of the Rochester movement as a failure in democracy. "Blinded by prejudice, narrowed by partisanship, made cowardly by suspicions, we have been kept back from the joy of human fellowship, we have let the government get out of our hands, we have failed of great achievement."[77]

Thanks to Professor Shedd, however, the No. 9 center, which was given a tiny appropriation by the school board to carry on its work, was able to provide one final example of how political bosses could crush efforts at free speech, especially when discussions led to somewhat radical and threatening positions on capitalist rule. The Rochester Socialists continually gained in electoral strength in these years and constituted a possible threat to boss rule; and they were always quick to denounce George Aldridge publicly as an enemy of the people and Socialism. In 1911, however, the city administration was finally able to help eliminate Socialist speeches in the schools when Shedd gave a speech at No. 9 which praised the red flag as the true international symbol of peace and human brotherhood; the stars and stripes, he argued, where limited to the love of a particular country but not mankind.

Shedd's words were twisted out of context by the mayor and the city press and termed by the Democrat and Chronicle as "radical and revolutionary propagandism."[78] The mayor actually barred Shedd from speaking in any municipal building. Shedd nevertheless accepted an invitation from the Labor Lyceum to speak on the subject of "Free Speech," but the Socialists, who had been permitted to meet on Sunday evenings in the city hall, were refused admittance. Once again, the Republican machine seized the opportunity to consolidate its power and defeat its opponents, whether they were the Good Government forces or the Socialists. "Political" speeches were thereafter banned in the schools and the Socialists were locked out of City Hall. After being arrested with other Socialists for "obstructing the sidewalk" at one protest rally, Shedd was forced to resign from the University of Rochester, from a post he had held for many years.[79] Thus ended the most famous effort of the Progressive era to adapt the spirit of the little red school house to an urban setting.

IV

By 1914 Edward Ward had become the leading social center advocate in the nation. Forced to leave Rochester when Boss Aldridge's Board of Estimate slashed the social center appropriation, Ward gained new visibility as an Advisor in Social Center Development in the extension division of the University of Wisconsin. There he worked for several years, until finally finishing his career decades later in the Justice Department in Washington. After 1910, Ward continued to publicize the value of neighborhood civic clubs, the wider use of the schools, and general educational extension. And he did not let his failures in Rochester dim his optimism. Writing in 1914 in Rochester's leading social welfare journal, The Common Good, Ward criticized local individuals who feared that perhaps Aldridge and others were correct in believing that the centers were a bad idea. "Cheer up, old pal," he responded, "your Rochester may be stuck in the mud, but--There are other Rochesters."[80]

There were indeed many other potential Rochesters across the nation that tried to emulate some of the best features of Ward's ideas from the city on the Genesee. For years after Ward and his staff were fired in New York, local newspapers like the now independent Toledo News-Bee and the Socialist Social Democratic Herald and Milwaukee Leader publicized the extension activities that brought fame to the Rochester centers. In fact, one of the first acts of the new Socialist working-class administration elected to office in Milwaukee in 1910 was to hire Ward, a fellow Socialist, as a technical advisor on civic club development.[81] Hence there were indications of other Rochesters, and Ward personally helped organize hundreds of social centers in small towns and villages throughout Wisconsin. And in city after city, from Toledo to Milwaukee to Kansas City, local reformers worked with different degrees of success to capture that elusive spirit of the little red school house.

Like so many other urban schools, Toledo had a rule against community use of the schools except for special occasions. Women's clubs and parent organizations, however, gained permission to the schools during the late Nineties. The idea of broader community use of the schools also comprised a central concern of the mayoral administrations of Samuel M. Jones and Brand Whitlock between 1897 and 1913. Jones' Annual Reports to the city council always contained glowing statements on the value of new social services and school extension. With the support of female leaders like Mary Law and Pauline Steinem, he and Whitlock agitated for the use of the schools as community meeting places.[82] After it became clear that the "reformed" school board after the passage of the Niles Bill was Republican and devoted to business efficiency, the Democratic Evening Bee also endorsed this effort at school extension. "If Toledo were to build public halls or meeting houses in every ward in the city," speculated the Bee in 1898, "the people would probably get together once in a while to discuss matters of public interest. As it is they think there is no place to meet...What's the matter with the school buildings for public meetings? They belong to the people."[83]

Although the wider use concept in Toledo was not exactly similar to the neighborhood civic clubs that Edward Ward would later develop in Rochester, by the turn of the century Golden Rule Jones and the Complete Education League petitioned the school board for permission to hold weekly neighborhood meetings and entertainments in individual schools. An outgrowth of the Children's Playground Association, the Complete Education League was formed in 1900 and, as will be recalled, fought for a wide range of school social services and programs. Despite the personal animosity of many school board members like J. Kent Hamilton toward Jones, there was enough popular support from women's and labor groups for the social center idea that the League's petitions were approved and a new educational experiment began in this Ohio city.

With the help of the Complete Education branch of the City Federation of Women's Clubs, Jones and his followers ran various community programs in the local schools between 1900 and 1904, the year of the mayor's death. Like so many of the innovations sponsored by Jones, the centers attracted wide support and considerable publicity in Toledo. At first the school board only let the Complete Education League meet in a few buildings, determined largely by whether or not they had a school auditorium. In early 1900, the Lagrange School, located in a Polish neighborhood north of central city, was opened for weekly entertainments. Jones himself performed on stage, joining with local singing groups and contributing some tunes on his violin.[84] The response to these entertainments was overwhelming. Large groups of foreign and native-born citizens flocked to these entertainments. Racially mixed audiences, reportedly containing individuals with a wide range of economic backgrounds, gave them a strong community feeling. Over 1,300 people packed into the Lagrange auditorium on one occasion, and Jones typically urged the school board to open every school in the city for wider use. The Evening Bee noted that Jones was a bit of a crank, but agreed that few innovations in the history of the city had attracted such popular support in such a short period of time. "Why not bring the parents into closer association with the schools?" asked Negley Cochran of the Bee, for then the schools could become "a club for the people at night."[85]

Between 1900 and 1902, the Complete Education League expanded its work across the city to poor as well as wealthy neighborhoods, to the elite sections on Collingwood as well as on the East Side. Aiding in the work were Complete Education Leagues that organized in several of the ward schools. Some of the entertainments and invited speakers at local centers were so popular that every seat in the meeting rooms was occupied by seven o'clock, an hour before the festivities, and police officers were routinely dispatched to the schools to help people find a seat safely.[86] While popular support developed for this aspect of the new education, the essentially Republican school board dominated by J. Kent Hamilton rejected petitions from the League urging it to fund more extensive programs and to construct auditoriums for every school. Finally, in a dramatic confrontation between the school board and Jones' followers, the school board in 1902 limited the League to a handful of schools. While petitioners claimed that "the tendency of the times is to provide assembly rooms in school buildings, for the use of teachers, pupils, and their parents," businessmen called the reformers faddists who would lead the schools to economic ruin.[87]

"The public school buildings belong to the people," argued the News-Bee in 1904 in an effort to stir additional support for the wider use of the schools. "They are paid for with money taken from the people by taxation. Yet every night in the year the buildings are dark and closed, while the owners of the buildings are hunting for small halls in which to hold public gatherings."[88] By closing almost all the schools for evening use, the Hamilton school board contributed to its own downfall; it was replaced in 1905 by a more Progressive membership generally supportive of the new education and especially social centers. Nine new auditoriums were constructed in the city by 1909, and additional ones were planned by the school board and its new superintendent, William B. Buitteau (1909-1921). Guitteau was a dynamic individual who had once been an activist among the younger teachers and was dedicated to school expansion. He was a personal friend of Pauline Steinem and Brand Whitlock, two of Toledo's leading grass-roots reformers, and he wrote long articles in praise of Rochester's social centers for local newspapers.[89] Despite the favorable local atmosphere for wider use, however, Toledo's social center movement died a quick death after 1912 when the Smith Law passed in the state legislature placed severe tax limitations on Ohio's cities.

The Smith Law prohibited Toledo's school board from increasing any particular annual budget in excess of one per cent of the previous year.[90] Inflation rapidly increased after 1910, the growth of the school age population continued, and therefore local school boards, while sympathetic to the social center movement between 1905 and World War I, were strapped economically; they were unable to extend many programs like social centers without eliminating school construction. The city-wide parent-teachers' federation called for the use of the schools "for all purposes of an education nature" in 1912, and women's clubs, neighborhood groups, and the Young Men's Progressive League (a group of recent high school graduates) all petitioned for easy access to the schools.[91] Groups were allowed to meet in schools with auditoriums, as long as no expenses were incurred by the school board, but the paucity of public funds limited the range of activities, prevented the hiring of special staff members to help coordinate activities, and greatly weakened local efforts at social center development.

If there were other Rochesters, as Edward Ward believed, Toledo was not one of them. The neighborhood civic idea that briefly existed in Rochester never fully matured in the city of the Golden Rule, primarily for economic reasons peculiar to Ohio's financial system. As a result, Toledo received very little national recognition for its efforts at school extension, even less than Milwaukee, which had a very strong reputation as a Progressive city devoted to social services, child welfare, and of course Socialism. As in most American cities, voluntary associations had first opened the Milwaukee schools for wider use in the Nineties when the Woman's School Alliance and the South Side Educational Association gained permission to meet regularly at the neighborhood schools.[92] The Populists and Socialists, however, contended that the ward-based, council-appointed school board failed to go far enough in school extension, and after the turn of the century the Social Democrats attacked the commission-appointed and then court-appointed school boards that also moved haltingly toward wider use.

The Socialists saw the wider use of the schools as one possible vehicle to democratize the city and educate citizens on the problems of municipal government and capitalism. In 1902 the municipal platform of the Social Democratic Party called for the free and unlimited use of the schools by all neighborhood groups. Socialists viewed the reform as part of the larger class struggle. "The unions, thanks to the plucking process of the present industrial system, are composed of poor men," claimed the Social Democratic Herald in 1902. "The halls they meet in are at present dingy and mean, and badly ventilated, because they cannot afford to hire better ones."[93] Moreover, Socialist politicians and later representatives on the school board emphasized the need for free speech in the schools, and they attacked the state social center law of 1911 that permitted school access only to "non-partisan" and "non-religious" groups.

Meta Berger fought with fellow school board member Lizzie Kander to delete the restrictive clauses on social center use in 1914, but she failed because only roughly one-third of the fifteen member board during the war years were Social Democrats. Kander was not a Socialist but a liberal reformer. Yet her support for social innovations, pacifism, and trade unionism led her into the Socialist camp on most areas of educational policy.[94] Free speech at the social centers remained a burning issue in municipal politics. Meta Berger asserted in 1914 that the "fathers and mothers should be free to use [the schools] for the consideration of anything that affects their homes or the community life."[95] Kander and the Social Democrats agreed, but businessmen on the school board opposed the unregulated use of the schools, fearing that such a policy would spread undesirable "isms," as they called them, throughout Milwaukee. Victor Berger quipped that the idea of public social centers without free discussion--the heart of the Rochester idea--was like telling children they could go swimming as long as they stayed away from the water. Writing in the Milwaukee Leader in 1916, he also asserted that "for parents and children alike, the questions of light, transportation, wages, housing, and all the other important issues...are certainly of as great importance as the Three R's."[96] His position never altered the votes of business elites on the school board but well expressed the dissenting views of the Socialists on social center policy in the Progressive era.

With Socialist support, the movement for easier access and wider use of the schools nevertheless accelerated in the early twentieth century. Socialist aldermen first elected to office in 1904 championed the cause for several years before a liberal women's group, the Social Economics Club, petitioned the city council in 1906 for several thousand dollars for recreational programs for congested school districts. In 1908 a coalition of community organizations finally helped open an actual center in the Sixth Street School, a poor district and the earlier site of the city's first public, supervised playground. The Federation of Civic Societies, which represented the majority of the voluntary associations of Milwaukee, advanced the idea as well as the Socialists, who promised a comprehensive plan of wider use for all sections of town if their party attained political hegemony.[97]

Partially because of Ward's influence and partially because of the Socialists' continual interest in using the schools for social reconstruction, nearly one-fourth of Milwaukee's neighborhood schools had adult Neighborhood Civic Clubs by 1912.[98] The majority of the schools were also used after that year as polling places for municipal elections, and the voters approved a special tax for social centers, playgrounds, and vacation schools. Hence, Milwaukee went far beyond Toledo in social center reform. There were still numerous problems with the widespread establishment of all of these programs because of rising costs, growing enrollments, and increased school construction demands. Perennial conflicts over the aims of the social centers between community reformers and school officials also hindered their progress. The school board and the superintendents after 1904, Carroll G. Pearse (1904-1913) and Milton Potter (1914-1943), all endorsed social centers, but they officially opposed permitting all types of meetings in the schools. The social center director was no Edward Ward, for he diligently tried to fulfill the letter of the law by screening partisan and religious groups out of the schools. Moreover, men like Harold Berg of the educational extension division wanted to use the centers to Americanize Milwaukee's many immigrant groups and claimed that extended use of the schools would lure children away from street gangs and civilize them.[99]

There was a genuine ideological conflict in Milwaukee over the main objectives of the social center. School board president William Pipelow argued in 1909 that the centers would be "a place for study and congenial occupation during the evening, for those less fortunate in home surroundings."[100] In essense, he saw them as charity institutions, the very things that Ward and many Socialists abhorred. Many businessmen on the school board were only interested in the centers because they likened the schools to a "plant" which, like any factory, should run continuously to ensure maximum production and efficiency. Like many publicists on the national level, they narrowly equated the school house with a factory. "Consider the school house a business plant. The greatest return from such a plant is secured by running it to its capacity," argued John H. Puelicher, a banker and the President of the school board in 1911.[101]

Just as the intellectual history of social centers in Milwaukee was a clash between efficiency and democratic values, so too was their social history shaped by the interaction between competing and contradictory forces. The Social Democrats never regarded themselves as "non-partisan," but they were very active in many Neighborhood Civic Clubs, where they tried to publicize their critical appraisals of society. Many school officials, on the other hand, believed that the schools were prime sources of Americanization and patriotism. Some newcomers undoubtedly learned enough at the naturalization classes at the social centers to earn their citizenship papers, yet it is also clear that voluntary attendance meant that neighborhoods could ignore programs and activities that were demeaning or insulting. Finns, Poles, Swedes, and Russians all petitioned successfully for the free use of the schools for community meetings, formed cohesive Neighborhood Civic Clubs, and found value in the concept of wider use even if they did not desire full Americanization or to become cogs in a civic efficiency machine.[102]

The Milwaukee Free Press, one of the most volatile anti-Socialist papers in the city, sent reporters to investigate the progress of Milwaukee's first social center. Since the neighborhood was a hodgepodge of different nationalities, they found numerous immigrants reading books in Yiddish, German, Polish, and Bohemian. Most were aliens who could not speak any English and were only able to communicate with the young librarian at the branch library. The librarian was a remarkable man who had mastered five different languages. Congregating all of these people under a single roof might seem like an ideal means of Americanization, but the Free Press complained that these adults would perhaps listen attentively (or so it seemed) to a lecture on sanitation, but "in religion and race loyalty they are immovable."[103] By the same token, Italian parents whose children attended extension activities at the Detroit Street School kept an inordinately close watch on their siblings, undoubtedly to keep a firm hand in their children's socialization. "They come in crowds to all meetings, either to take part in social activities or to look on when their children take part in school activities."[104]

Even Americanizers who praised the good work of the naturalization classes found in some social centers admitted that the "prevailing foreign language of the neighborhood is catered to through books and periodicals," or there was a distinct possibility that no one would attend them.[105] Moreover, ethnic groups occasionally formulated social center activities with the expressed intent of preserving their ethnic culture and retarding Americanization. Over a thousand Jews from the Ninth Street School neighborhood successfully petitioned the schools in 1915 for their own class in Yiddish history, literature, and poetry. "We seek to establish this school," they argued, "to perpetuate the Jewish race."[106]

Milwaukeeans were therefore not simply clay that was molded at will by the social center directors or the board of education. Segments of Milwaukee's society used the schools as best they could for their own intellectual, cultural, and social ends. They did this despite the fact that school leaders did not always share the same perspective on their culture or view them as more than mere material for school production. Even children and young adults to some degree shaped recreational programs to fit some of their own needs. "The working boys of Milwaukee are not found to be particularly fond of formal gymnastics after a hard day's work, so athletic games are featured," wrote one social center director. "The girls have shown a distinct inclination for club, wand, and dumb-bell drills, aesthetic dancing, and folk dancing."[107] School populations voluntarily attended the vacation schools, playgrounds, and social centers. As a result they often became a force of their own in these situations.

This does not mean that the Milwaukee schools were transformed into ideal community centers in the Progressive era. Overcrowding in some neighborhoods and a lack of funds meant that some auditoriums were converted into makeshift classrooms, thereby hurting adult access to the local school.[108] The "non-partisan" and "non-religious" restrictions of the schools remained on the books despite Socialist opposition. And, as will later be seen, school board officials used the social centers to propagandize and justify American involvement in World War I, again in spite of Socialist and pacifist criticism. Free speech, a key issue in the whole social center movement in some cities, was sacrificed in the interests of furthering the war effort. Yet the Milwaukee schools to some degree had become another Rochester, as Ward had hoped when he first helped the Socialist administration in Milwaukee in 1910. The Neighborhood Civic Clubs lasted longer than they had in Rochester, and in the 1920s the Milwaukee social centers were regarded as some of the best and most innovative in the nation. Rochester's, on the other hand, were mostly remembered for the short if glorious reign of Edward J. Ward.[109]

In a short pamphlet called The Social Center in Kansas City (1913), the Board of Public Welfare demonstrated that James M. Greenwood's Kansas City was not untouched by the national movement for the wider use of the schools. Emphasizing the importance of cities like Rochester, Milwaukee, Chicago, and New York in social center development, its author traced the slow development of the idea in Kansas City. First came the mothers' unions, which blossomed into P.T.A.'s which pounded on the school house door seeking admission for their meetings and thereby setting the basis for wider use. Then came women's groups and some civic associations by the turn of the century, also viewing the schools as the center of the local neighborhood. What the author of this document failed to examine critically, however, was how community groups struggled as they had in Milwaukee and other cities against a conservative school administration and school board members who viewed the centers simply through the lens of business efficiency.[110] James M. Greenwood first became seriously interested in social center ideas in 1904 when he noted in his Annual Report that "the school houses lie idle 165 days out of every 365. There is no other great business institution in which there is so much money invested, that shuts up its doors for three-sevenths of its time and does not operate."[111]

Greenwood's ideas, of course, were not original, and he consistently avoided explaining how different segments of the community pushed for wider use but did not necessarily think in terms of business efficiency. As the Industrial Council resolved in 1911, the school administration and Greenwood had not "at times in the past given to organized labor that consideration that its intelligence and good citizenship should command." Hence they now should approve free and unlimited access to the schools for discussions of any conceivable subjects for those "who work in the factory, in the workshop, in the field, in the mine."[112] Although the local social center movement was as usual energized by many forces from the grass roots--mothers' unions, labor unions, women's clubs, and Socialist parties--Parent Teacher Associations in the long run dominated in the life of Kansas City's social centers. It is difficult to argue conclusively that the reason organized parents gave so much attention to the centers in Kansas City was due to the entrenched school board, comprised of elite businessmen and professionals since the 1870s, and to the long term rule of Greenwood from 1874 to 1914. But certainly the associations tried to bring the schools closer to particular neighborhoods, to better relations with teachers, and to make the schools generally of more service to the community.

By 1914 nearly every one of the fifty-nine schools of Kansas City, in both black and white as well as native and foreign-born neighborhoods, had active P.T.A.'s. Because of mounting citizen pressure, the school board designated a few white and black schools as "social centers" after 1910 where, in these segregated settings, neighborhoods received popular lectures and different entertainments in the local schools. While the Rochester and Toledo social centers were definitely integrated, the Kansas City centers, like the P.T.A.'s, were not.[113] In their own separate spheres, white and black parents endeavored to increase their civic intelligence through public lecture series, to decrease their boredom through civic discussions, and in many other ways to use the schools for personal and social improvement. As in most cities, partisan and religious organizations were prohibited from using the schools, but the local P.T.A.'s did their best to keep the idea of wider use alive. The several thousand P.T.A. members utilized the schools on a monthly or bi-monthly basis, forming the largest group locally that engaged in after-hours attendance in the local schools.[114]

The social center movement, as it was variously conceived on the grass roots in different urban contexts, was in many ways a reaction against the centralizing tendencies of the age. The thousands of parents in Kansas City who regularly met at their schools were only part of the larger effort on the local level to make schools more serviceable, closer to the people, and relevant. For many grass-roots Progressives--whether they were in parents' organizations, labor unions, women's clubs, or Socialist parties--the social center symbolized a growing belief that the schools could help improve the quality of urban life. Like so many other innovations, it became a battleground between many individuals who were critical of the movement away from local control and the Mutual Admiration Societies that had swept into power in many cities by the turn of the century. Because of conflicts between community groups and school leaders, the centers were not merely effective instruments of social manipulation and repression as historians have occasionally argued but like all voluntary institutions a product of give and take, with the schools clearly in a position of power though not complete dominance. Socialists, immigrants, and many other citizens fought against the restrictions on free speech and the efficiency aims of the school managers and to the best of their ability tried to keep the spirit of democratic revolt and social interaction alive in local cities.

Like the vacation schools, playgrounds, and other new innovations, the social centers suffered from a basic lack of funding, class biases, and ideological conflict. Many people easily agreed on the virtues of wider use but strenuously disagreed on how it would be implemented. And, compared to the many other social institutions that still existed in local neighborhoods--like saloons, pool halls, and other sources of amusement and general education--the social center activities found in any particular school were never widespread enough to challenge the more accessible institutions. One did not have to petition the saloon keeper for permission to discuss public issues at his bar, nor did one have to ask him whether partisan and religious issues were taboo. Saloons were undoubtedly more the people's club than the schools could ever hope to be. For many, beer and free sandwiches were better than red tape. As far as Edward Ward and many grass-roots Progressives were concerned, the heart of the real social center idea was free speech, for if individuals were limited in public discussions to such extents as they often were in the social centers, the schools could not possibly contribute to the intelligent formulation of public policy in a representative democracy. The so-called spirit of the little red school house remained more an image of a distant rural past than a reality of the urban school.

The School Health Movement

> It is useless to try to educate starving children. The hungry child cries out for food, and we give him a book.
>
> Meta Berger, 1909

> A very little study of sociology will convince the advocates of the 'race suicide' idea that a few perfect children are far better for the nation and the family than a dozen unkempt degenerates, who add pathos to the struggle for existence, and who sink under the inflexible law of the survival of the fittest.
>
> A physician in the Review of Reviews, 1907

I

The school health movement of the Progressive era illustrated Victor Berger's claim that two contradictory forces--a quest for efficiency and a search for democracy--vied for mastery in the schools.[1] This movement to broaden the school's responsibility for children's health attracted narrow-minded advocates of scientific management and business efficiency as well as Socialists and grass-roots liberals and radicals. School health crusades during these years included the first systematic efforts to establish breakfast, lunch, and general nutrition programs for the children of the poor; they also included medical and dental inspection, special classes for anemic and tubercular children, increased emphasis on sanitation and hygiene, and attempts to vaccinate every school child. Many grass-roots reformers viewed these programs as an attempt to improve the quality of urban life, to enhance the ability of poor children to excel in their studies, and to compensate for the substandard home and school environments caused by the economic system. Many school superintendents, elite school board members, and other powerful individuals, however, viewed better school health not as an exercise in democracy but as a form of capital investment, a response to so-called inferior immigrants who populated local neighborhoods, and a tool of social integration and control.

The concept of a healthy mind in a healthy body was a time-honored one in educational theory by the turn of the century. Only then, however, were specific programs established to improve children's health and, it was argued, to give them an equal chance to learn. Explaining exactly why many individuals suddenly embraced the ancient notion of in corpore sano at this particular time remains central to understanding the evolution of new urban social services in the Progressive era. Educators had long argued that sanitation, hygiene, and the overall health of children and the physical quality of their home and school environments directly affected school achievement. Throughout the years of early common school reform in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City, school leaders emphasized the significance of the ventilation, heating, and overall construction of school buildings. Sanitation and health were key aspects of educational thought in the nineteenth century.[2] But few educators then entertained the notion that the school had the responsibility to feed children, even if they were starving, or to examine their bodies for dental caries, adenoids, or heart disease. The line between home and school responsibilities, so carefully drawn in the nineteenth century, gradually shifted in the Progressive era. The school became increasingly involved in health programs, recreation, vacations, and other activities once considered private concerns.

This change was not an accident of history, and it provided considerable debate and controversy in many communities. By the late nineteenth century, for example, scientific investigations had demonstrated to many people the validity of the germ theory of disease. The work of Edward Jenner and other pioneers in the treatment of communicable diseases in particular was legitimized by prominent leaders in the scientific community. Inoculation, however, was not always accepted by every urban citizen or by all physicians. Many people still viewed diseases like tuberculosis as hereditary, or saw them as a sign of God's displeasure with the so-called immorality of the poor, and reacted strongly against the idea of placing foreign matter in the human bloodstream.[3]

In the past health officers and school officials had excluded individuals with infectious diseases from the general population through quarantine. Now, however, they increasingly sought to diagnose many non-communicable ailments and to eliminate medical impediments which presumably encouraged the development of "dull" and "backward" children. Science seemed to offer hope at last that healthy bodies would indeed produce healthy minds--or at least children who could properly recite their lessons, correctly do their sums, and sit in classes of the same age group.

There was more behind the school health movement than some simple though humane desire to improve the health of each individual and to enhance personal development. Physicians and educators who wrote the leading books and journal articles on school health in the Progressive era often agreed on the wonders of science in improving human comforts. At the same time they often agreed on the inferiority of the new immigrant populations and the poor who formed majorities in many urban neighborhoods. Poverty-stricken neighborhoods, wrote one professor of public health, had "a concentration of tuberculosis stock, of alcoholic stock, of feeble-minded stock--poor protoplasm and a bad environment supplementing each other in a vicious cycle."[4] Of all groups, the urban poor were therefore most in need of inspection and care. Science was not value free, conducive to culturally plural beliefs, or necessarily critical of the economic system that helped produce poverty, illness, and disease. Instead, the wider use of the schools for health reform often centered on the need to perfect a stronger race, to promote personal and social "efficiency," and to pinpoint the obvious flaws in the children of the native-born and immigrant poor.

"The children of to-day must be viewed as the raw material of the State," wrote Lewis Terman in 1914. "To conserve this raw material is as logical a function of the State as to conserve the natural resources of coal, iron, and water power."[5] A nationally prominent advocate of eugenics, efficiency, scientific management in education, and psychological testing, Terman represented a new wave of educational thinkers who equated the school house with the school plant and saw medical inspection as a panacea for most educational ills. Like so many other writers, he believed that school failure was produced by the health problems of specific classes and immigrant groups; he rarely discussed the possible environmental causes of personal maladies or appreciated the cultural gaps that separated many immigrants from the public schools. Yet he would have had little quarrel with those who believed that better school health promoted "race betterment" and "the production of greater efficiency" in school and society.[6]

Leaders of the efficiency movement for school health scoffed at the so-called sentimentalists who wanted healthy children as a moral end in itself. "The movement to save human life is not alone a matter of mere sentiment. It pays to keep people alive," wrote an educator in 1912 in the Pedagogical Seminary, a journal which soon evolved into the Journal of Genetic Psychology.[7] Although human life was increasingly reduced by many to a matter of dollars and cents and tied to cost accounting-like perspectives, this dominant viewpoint was not unchallenged. Many people believed that efficiency was a narrow and unacceptable rationale for bettering the health of the nation's youth. This conflict between efficiency and democracy, between theories of human capital formation and more humane beliefs in bettering children's lives, informed many of the ideological and educational debates of the Progressive era--from the playground movement to local social center experiments. From the time of early common school reform through the Progressive era, competing social and political interests vied for the attention of the state. And nowhere was the conflict now better dramatized than in the movement to feed the malnourished children of the urban poor. Conflicting ideas vied for supremacy in the urban school.

II

The French statesman Danton once noted that "after Bread, Education is the first need of a people."[8] Like many writers before him, he believed that sufficient food and education should be the cornerstones of a strong national state. It was not until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, that a wide range of individuals searched for the exact interrelationship between nutrition and learning. During these years there emerged a transatlantic reform movement, including numerous educators, physicians, political activists, and grass-roots citizens, that publicly debated the connection between nutritional development and educational attainment and its possible impact on social policy. The suggestion of feeding starving or poorly nourished children at public expense raised a host of competing ideas, which still face modern policymakers: parental versus school responsibilities, socialist versus capitalist views of the social order, and the rights of the child and the state.

Municipal and state funding of school meals were volatile political issues in Europe and America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Meals for the urban poor in France, Germany, and other European nations pre-dated American efforts in the early 1900s, and Socialist trade unions were often in the forefront of state intervention. The Social Democratic Federation of England, for example, denounced the role of privately sponsored soup kitchens and charity meals given to undernourished street waifs. "If justice were done, charity would be unnecessary," it regularly proclaimed.[9] Hence it is not surprising that when the Federation formed in 1884, it immediately included one free meal per day for every child, not as a charity but as a human right. The Fabian Society, organized in the same year, also endorsed this platform.[10] From the very start, therefore, the issue of feeding children at state expense was a highly political one, certain to polarize those forces that competed for the control of mass education and public welfare in the twentieth century. What was at stake in many Western nations was the control and political power of the dependent classes and the urban poor.

Socialist and working-class groups in America like those overseas strenuously fought for government intervention to feed hungry children as a matter of justice. When it came to that most fundamental duty and pleasure--to feed their children, and to feed them well--the laborers who presumably created the world's wealth often lacked the means to care effectively for their families. Class dominance, radicals argued, ensured that workers and their families remained in a precarious nutritional state. Before leaving the priesthood to become an organizer for the Socialist Party, Rev. William Brown of Rochester asserted in 1902 that workers had to sell themselves to the lowest bidder on the marketplace or else starve along with their dependents.[11] The Rochester Socialist a few years later berated the fact that "little babies" lacked sufficient food while millionaires tended to consume goods conspicuously at lavish parties and in other activities.[12]

Socialists and different segments of Toledo's working class similarly believed that starvation was an unjust reward for its labor. As a representative of the Central Labor Union argued in

1897, an acceptance of social Christianity meant that "men are not born to hunger and die in the midst of plenty."[13] Perceived contradictions of progress and poverty, so obviously apparent in the depression Nineties, made such reanalysis of Christian faith and practice commonplace among working groups and urban radicals. The Socialists of Toledo in 1905 tried to win seats on the school board through a platform calling for free clothes and food "for children requiring the same."[14] Their local newspaper, The Socialist, repeatedly featured exposes of starving children in the city and across the nation. "If I am elected to the school board, I will do all in my power to secure the feeding of hungry school children, and the clothing of them, if necessary," argued Josephine Bates in 1909 during an unsuccessful bid to office.[15]

Milwaukee's Social Democratic Party and the Federated Trades Council warmly endorsed publicly-financed meals programs for school children--for all of them, not just for the poor, and as a human right, not as a charity. "The hungry child cries out for food, and we give him a book," noted the leading Socialist clubwoman and school board member, Meta Berger.[16] The Milwaukee Socialists saw starvation or malnutrition as a convenient means by which wealthier classes continued to control the working classes. Moreover, the Socialists continually called for free meals as a "humane gesture" of the citizenry, not as a way to promote "efficiency" or "race betterment." In what it termed a "humanitarian resolution," the Federated Trades Council in 1909 called for immediate aid for the "many children who are suffering from an insufficiency of food."

> Resolved, A civilized community should hold itself responsible for its rising generation, and unless it takes practical measures for their proper care and protection it will be punished for its cruel indifference.[17]

The contradictions of living in a nation which extolled the virtues of industry, application, and labor and yet permitted hunger among many hard-working citizens was not lost upon many Kansas Citians during the same period. The editor of the People's Advocate in 1902 expressed his disgust through simple rhyme in a poem entitled "A Modern Business Sermon."

> I know a bold and honest man,
> Who strives to live on a Christian plan;
> But poor is he and poor will he be,
> At home a starving wife, soon
> a wreck is he.[18]

"Labor is the source of all wealth. Without it the wheels of commerce would cease to move and chaos and starvation would immediately follow," argued the Labor Herald in 1904.[19] But the wheels of commerce reeled and men, women, and children still hungered, as urban radicals repeatedly testified. "Capitalism is slavery," contended the editor of the Missouri Staats-Zeitung in 1909. The industrialists "have the masses under their control. They can starve them to death, or freeze them to death, or work them to death."[20] Certainly not all workers were hungry, freezing, or starving, but the fact that the promise of American life was denied to some motivated many individuals to espouse reform.

Working-class organizations and Socialist parties throughout urban America repeatedly championed the cause of underfed and malnourished school children. In their speeches and newspapers, they presented muckraking exposes of tenement life and reprinted selections of famous books that dealt with the problems of hunger and human want. Photographs of hungry children with peering eyes and desperate appearance touched the hearts of many readers. And through popular magazines and books, Americans were exposed to the underside of social life. In his classic volume Poverty, the moderate Socialist Robert Hunter sympathetically described the millions of Americans who were "underfed, underclothed, and badly housed," all the while emphasizing that "the great majority are children who have neither violated social laws nor committed any sin."[21] John Spargo, author of The Bitter Cry of the Children, similarly inspired social action when he discovered thousands of children trapped in a "heritage of poverty."[22]

The nation's first systematic efforts to feed the children of the urban poor during the Progressive era did not simply develop through working class and Socialist pressure. Social change was an interactive process, full of conflict between dominant forces and challenges to the status quo. A brief comparison between

England and America highlights the broader political and ideological context of early school meal programs. Initial state involvement in meals for urban children in the early 1900s did not indicate a national acceptance of any full-blown welfare state in either England or America. Rather, this was a transitional period in which the ethic of personal responsibility and individualism clashed with newer theories of public intervention for private welfare. Many influential individuals of the era retained traditional notions on the causes of poverty and the value of philanthropy in ministering to the needs of the poor. Strong ideological and class perceptions on education, nutrition, and state involvement discouraged the creation of comprehensive, equitable school meal programs for all urban school children--despite considerable evidence that meals helped improve the health and well-being of the urban school child.

The circumstances surrounding the passage of the Provision of Meals Act in England (1906) and its eventual implementation highlight these basic considerations. The act disheartened many people: conservatives who preferred Social Darwinist ideals for the marketplace, and socialist trade unions that wanted a more expansive nutritional program.[23] The national Trade Union Congress, which adopted the socialist position on free meals in the late nineteenth century, increasingly clamored for the theory of "state maintenance"; by the early 1900s, the trade unionists lobbied for their cuase in the halls of Parliament through Liberal leadership. The Liberals rejected the ideological precepts on which maintenance rested--the establishment of a socialist state. They responded to political pressures from below with legislation mandating pensions for the old and meals for the young within an essentially capitalist framework.[24]

This clash between labor radicals and Liberal politicians clearly reflected the class conflicts underlying the meal debate, and it presaged similar struggles that would occur in this country. The Meals Act itself survived only through the persistence of Liberal Imperialists like Dr. Thomas J. Macnamara and the Tory leader Sir John Gorst, both of whom rejected socialist alternatives to the existing social order and worked to undermine any further radicalization of the working classes.[25] While supporting various levels of state intervention for nutritional programs, these prominent leaders who guided the legislation through Parliament were not motivated by an unadulterated sympathy for the poor; instead, they feared the effects of racial deterioration and its possible impact on preserving a national empire.

In many ways both men perfectly reflected the theories of racial superiority current in contemporary intellectual thought, beliefs that attracted otherwise conservative empire builders to meal programs. The first royal commission incidentally concerned with the health and eating habits of the working classes convened in 1903; it assembled primarily because it was recognized that many recruits failed their military physical examinations during the Boer War. Hence the socialist trade unions and various settlement workers who proposed increased state entry into nutritional projects would never have secured legislative attention to their cause unless the ruling classes above them simultaneously perceived that an inferior racial stock meant the destruction of the empire and their current political and social dominance.[26]

Macnamara's plan was to give free meals to all school children, not only to the poor, and then fine and imprison working parents who failed to reimburse the state for the cost of the meals (unless they were previously declared paupers). Labor radicals denounced the plan as idiotic and insulting; many other citizens, on the other hand, viewed it as socialist and utopian. Opponents to the plan commonly believed that workers would never pay for meals if they could get them for nothing and that the cost would therefore be exorbitant, a position that did not disturb their opponents in the least. Macnamara nevertheless convinced his Parliamentary associates to overcome their fear of state involvement and view the meals as a form of self-interest and national investment. As early as 1899, he described his plan in the London Times, reminding his readers that "it is quite impossible to expect successfully to equip the intellect of the child whose stomach is empty." That, however, was insufficient cause to merit state intervention. As Macnamara increasingly argued to fellow Imperialists in the next several years, the nation must learn to fear "not Krupp guns and Continental jealousy" but the "wastrel, the ne'er-do-well, the social wreck, and the criminal" element that undermined the empire and the national health.[27] "Empire," Macnamara later added, "cannot be built on rickety and flat-chested citizens."[28]

School meals in this nation also evolved within a specific political framework and foreign policy orientation during the Progressive era. Beginning in the 1890s with the annexation of Hawaii and culminating with the war with Spain, American foreign policy shifted from a policy of internal acquisition of contiguous territory between the Atlantic and the Pacific, a policy usually referred to as "manifest destiny." Growing interest in markets abroad and competition with other Western nations led to control over islands like the Phillipines and Puerto Rico and an aggressive "big stick" diplomacy that characterized the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. During these decades there were numerous military interventions in the affairs of Caribbean and South and Central American nations, including intervention during the Mexican Revolution. All of these activities were nurtured by a concern for national strength and hemispheric dominance and, as it was openly perceived, racial superiority.[29]

The existence of an aggressive foreign policy in search of markets and colonies helped nurture the rise of the school health movement at the turn of the century. Efficiency reformers and activist physicians, for example, continually dismissed "sentimentalists" who simply wanted to feed hungry children because they were starving, might fail in their studies, or die prematurely. These matters interested them, but so did fear of racial decline and support for national strength. Leonard P. Ayers, co-author of the most important book on health care in education, Medical Inspection of Schools (1908), was well versed in imperialist thought, in the so-called genetic basis of intelligence, and in theories of racial superiority. For several years he was the General Superintendent of the Schools of Puerto Rico before joining the Russell Sage Foundation as an expert in child care and hygiene.[30] In the beginning of their famous book, Ayres and his medical associate, Luther Gulick, emphasized that health care in the schools was largely a response to changing patterns of immigration to this nation--principally new stock and poor Central and Southern Europeans. By the end of their volume, Ayres and Gulick highlighted not the importance of helping children as a moral end in itself but of maximizing "efficiency" and of saving money by establishing a healthier racial stock.[31]

In both England and America, therefore, accelerated interest in school meals rested upon elite fears of a deteriorating racial stock and desires for national development. Children were perceived as "raw material" and equated with "natural resources" like water and oil. Even if they sometimes had "poor protoplasm," they represented the potential manpower for a strong foreign policy. Influential individuals like Macnamara in England and Ayres in America condemned the existence of starving populations in their respective countries. They understood that poorer classes suffered from more disease and illness than wealthier citizens. Yet these reformers nevertheless refused to criticize the economic system that contributed to inadequate housing, low wages, deteriorating neighborhoods, and subsequent disease. Since they were often attracted to eugenic-based theories of development, these men concluded that health problems were of a personal or group origin and did not especially result from structural defects in the larger social system. Illness stemmed from defective and inferior racial stocks, and better health care protected the citizenry from these individuals and increased national strength and efficiency.

Whether one believed in the power of eugenics or in the environment, in bolstering the prevailing economic system or in establishing a new social order, numerous individuals at the turn of the century assumed that starving children made poor scholars. This belief was a constant theme in contemporary literature on education and nutrition. "Is it possible with empty stomachs to pay attention to the multiplication tables?" asked Jonathan Taylor, a prominent English Socialist, as early as 1884.[32] After visiting poverty-stricken sections in England in the 1890s, William T. Stead, the Christian Socialist author of the best seller, If Christ Came to Chicago, concluded: "To drive children into school in order to fill their heads when they have nothing in their stomachs is like pouring water into a sieve."[33]

Studies on the importance of early childhood nutrition in scholastic achievement and later physical and mental growth proliferated here as in England; and they (perhaps incorrectly) inferred a causal effect from the high correlation they discovered between malnutrition and school failure among working-class groups. The moderate American Socialist Robert Hunter wrote that "learning is difficult [for the poor] because hungry brains and languid bodies and thin blood are not able to feed the brain."[34] "A poorly fed child, it is quite plain, is unable to prosecute his studies with zest; he cannot prepare for the coming battle of life," asserted the Philadelphia North American in 1905 in a special report on underfed children in major American cities.[35]

Various social analysts in many cities concluded that malnutrition seriously impaired children's scholarship. "Undernourished children are especially susceptible to all diseases," claimed a woman's club leader in Rochester who added that medical problems blocked the academic progress of many children.[36] A principal of a poor neighborhood school told the Toledo Blade in 1908 that "it is as inhuman as it is impossible to compel a child to sit and study and recite with its stomach empty."[37] The local school superintendent similarly argued that many children were "so emaciated and hungry that it is a crime to expect them to be active, either mentally or physically."[38] As one Toledo Progressive asserted in 1912, "The brain cannot gnaw on problems while the stomach is gnawing on its empty self."[39]

In Milwaukee as in Kansas City, there were similar testimonies on the perceived connections between school failure and human hunger. "With children, being properly fed, is half the battle," asserted the Milwaukee Free Press in 1906. "In many cases it makes the difference between the fretful, ailing child, in no condition for study, and the bodily comfort which promotes good temper and alert attention."[40] A survey of numerous teachers in Milwaukee in 1911 concluded that proper nutrition made children who were "restless, dull, and difficult to manage" into "studious, tractable, and bright" scholars.[41] Even if all citizens did not accept the alleged racial superiority of old stock immigrants or endorse theories of human capital formation, many still believed that proper nutrition better equipped children for their studies.

Many individuals accepted the common viewpoint of the Kansas Citian who wrote in 1906 that "in our large cities many thousands are shelterless, thinly clad, and starving."[42] There were always some local residents, of course, who denied that anyone in America was hungry, but considerable numbers of people believed that many children in particular lacked proper nourishment. What citizens really disputed was whether local governments had any responsibility for this personal distress and whether state intervention would undermine parental responsibility. When the Chicago school board ordered an investigation of underfed children, nearly every charity group in the city opposed any intimation of municipal intervention, since that would only "increase dependency and cause parents to shirk their responsibilities."[43] "Who hesitates to take advantage of the State?" asked a worried member of the Ohio Board of State Charities, who feared a loss of "individual duty and responsibility" through such capricious actions.[44] Or, as the New York Times editorialized in 1909:

> Anything that enables the family provider to shift his burdens upon the State tends directly to State Socialism...The home has been regarded as the cradle of religion, intelligence, industry, and patriotism. Can the State, which sprung from the family, supercede it, or even exist without it?[45]

Despite these and other forms of opposition that periodically surfaced, women's groups, labor organizations, Socialist parties, liberals, and many educators after the turn of the century began the nation's first programs to feed impoverished school children.

By 1913, nearly three dozen cities had some form of meal service, besides many programs in towns and rural communities. Prominent members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Council of Jewish Women, and the National Congress of Mothers privately funded many of them, hoping "eventually that the School Board... will inaugurate the system in all public schools as part of their work and not as a charity."[46] Like many other social service reforms of the Progressive era--such as vacation schools, playgrounds, and many social centers--school meals were nevertheless initially targeted for the native and foreign-born poor. However much humanitarian impulses guided some advocates of school meals, this innovation became stamped as a municipal charity for the poor and caught between the tensions of efficiency and "race betterment" and a more humane consideration for children suffering from various health problems.

Domestic science advocates like Ellen Richards agitated for at-cost lunch programs in the Boston high schools as early as 1894. Similar programs also began in the secondary schools of Milwaukee, Rochester, and other cities later in that decade.[47] More commonly, however, contemporary women's clubs desired innovations in the elementary schools, which the majority of the children attended. The Rochester school board in the Nineties, however, equated school meals with "state paternalism" and "socialism." The only children who received any municipally-supported meals were the juvenile delinquents and street waifs who stayed at the State Industrial School, a residential facility where they received "milk, mush, and beans."[48] Representatives of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union nevertheless argued in 1897 that all children "need sufficient nourishing food, comfortable homelike surroundings, plenty of exercise and sunlight."[49] At the turn of the century, the Union operated inexpensive luncheons for working girls in local factories and served free milk at their vacation schools between 1899 and 1906. Between 1911 and 1913, they operated a handful of school lunches for poor children, until they finally convinced the local school board of the value of nutrition and school progress.[50]

A wide range of reformers advocated school lunches in Rochester as well as in Toledo. One of the first experiments with at-cost lunches in Toledo was at Golden Rule Jones' Acme Sucker Rod Company, where the mayor regularly ate with his employees. Increasingly, however, local reformers turned to the problems of hungry school children. As early as 1899, the Democratic Evening Bee argued that children "have a right to have enough to eat and to have food that the system needs."[51] By 1904, the Bee had provided several sensationalist examples of how undernourished school children failed in their studies. Soon many women's clubs, Independents, labor unions, and the local Socialist Party agitated for more attention to the nutritional needs of the poor. The Republican Toledo Blade accused parents of "negligence" for not feeding their children properly, but in spite of this many grass-roots reformers demanded new municipal programs.[52]

As in all aspects of social welfare during this period, club women and parents' groups were prominent in nutritional reform. An invited speaker before the Toledo Women's Educational Club in 1906 emphasized the poor quality of the food eaten by "the working classes" and underscored the plight of "the struggling poor, who eat only the slightest kind of a breakfast, go to work with a dinner bucket containing anything but nutritious food, and their children, no better fed."[53] Pauline Steinem, the Christian Socialist school board member and the friend of Golden Rule Jones and Brand Whitlock, endorsed free clothes, shoes, and food for any disadvantaged child. In such an atmosphere, Superintendent Charles Van Cleve soon developed a strong personal interest in aiding underfed children. "The child is not responsible for being in the world, nor for his condition in the world," wrote Van Cleve in 1908. "This is the only justification I ask for feeding children when they are hungry."[54]

In 1907 the Women's Educational Club established mid-morning luncheons in some of the poorest neighborhoods of Toledo. It first served meals to the Polish children in the Lagrange School (the site of the popular social center entertainments earlier conducted by Golden Rule Jones and the Complete Education League).

A sympathetic school board in turn installed gas stoves in several schools on the industrial East Side--at Birmingham, Ironville, and neighboring buildings. It was here that contemporaries responded to what John Spargo called "the bitter cry of the children," for it was here that the poorest children of Toledo attended school. Superintendent Van Cleve was overwhelmed by the conditions at the Birmingham school near the steel mills. "I noticed scholars whose faces were covered with heavy, water scabs, and who appeared to be suffering to such an extent that attention to study could not be expected. I believe that the disease, whatever it is, is largely if not altogether, due to malnutrition."[55] Moved by such scenes, school officials and local women's groups jointly operated breakfasts and lunches in the poorest Toledo neighborhoods throughout the Progressive era.

Milwaukee had the most extensive meal programs of all of these cities. With the firm support of local trade unions, several voluntary associations, and the Social Democratic Party, the Woman's School Alliance established the first free lunches for poor children in 1904. In that year a non-Socialist alderman who was moved by the spectacle of hungry children reported that malnutrition prevented many of them from excelling in their studies. The Alliance held a meeting to discuss the issue in October, and it unanimously resolved to fund luncheons in several schools. The women announced that "it has always been the aim of the Woman's School Alliance to support any measure tending to the betterment of existing conditions of children attending the public schools."[56] Since 1891 the Alliance had dispensed free clothes and shoes to deserving children, aided the vacation school experiments, formed parent teacher associations, lobbied for manual training and domestic science programs, and attacked corporal punishment. Year after year they fought for more money for the public schools, and now they took the major responsibility for funding another school social service.

Because of severe overcrowding in many Milwaukee schools, Alliance members served soup and crackers in their own homes at noon time for hungry children between 1904 and 1907. Only when adequate space was found at local schools did the luncheons finally move out of members' homes. By 1908 the Alliance operated about eleven luncheons that served an incredible 50,000 hot meals annually. It was clearly an enormous undertaking. School plays generated operating revenue, supplemented by contributions from organizations like the Social Culture Club, the South Side Women's Club, the Social Economics Club, and neighborhood parent and civic organizations.[57] Mrs. Charles B. Whitnall, a Socialist school board member, was the chairman of the Alliance's penny lunch division and consistently championed the rights of the poor. The President of the Alliance was also an activist, and she told the working-class Daily News in 1909 that "we believe it is the right of every child that is born into the world to have enough to eat and suitable clothes to wear."[58] Spurred on by such ideals, the Alliance joined with Socialists and liberals on the Milwaukee school board and demanded more attention to nutritional services. They pressured public officials until the board of education finally established school meals in 1917.

In many cities, therefore, local women's organizations initially operated the earliest school meals. They served them at the vacation schools or in poor neighborhoods during the regular year or, as in the case of the Women's School Alliance, in their own homes when necessary. They then pressured the efficiency-minded business and professional elites on local school boards to fund programs in selected schools, achieving success roughly by World War I. By then approximately one hundred cities in the United States had school meals for the poor, variously funded in different areas by voluntary organizations, charity groups, and local municipalities.[59]

Despite all the attention aroused by fears of racial deterioration and by desires to help children overcome nutritional handicaps, America as well as many European nations failed to establish equitable and comprehensive nutrition programs for urban school children. Nearly two-thirds of the school districts of England, for example, failed to create state-supported meals, since the Meals Act of 1906 was permissive rather than mandatory legislation.[60] Like the playgrounds, vacation schools, social centers, and other social service reforms of the turn of the century, school meals in America never reached the majority of school children, including many poor children who were supposedly most in need. Resistence to the expansion of these programs emanated from many different sources, and it blunted the effectiveness of this new social reform.

Since Socialists were often the earliest and most consistent champions of free meals in Europe and America, Catholic organizations in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City strenuously denounced school meals as a form of state paternalism that would lead to a Socialistic and presumably atheistic government. The Rochester Federation of Catholic Societies, it will be recalled, attacked social centers, vacation schools, and playgrounds and denounced Christian Socialists like Edward J. Ward. It also adamantly opposed any other tax-supported social services, including free meals.[61] When Christian Socialists like Pauline Steinem, liberal school board members, and clubwomen secured municipal funding for school meals in Toledo, the Lucas County Federation of Catholic Societies in 1909 similarly condemned this new educational policy. The distribution of free food, it claimed, was "unsound and most harmful to the spirit of American liberty, American independence, and American self help."[62] This Catholic organization typically called for more parental responsibility, urged parents to feed their own children, and warned the citizenry of further state encroachment. The Smith Law more than Catholic opposition paralyzed the local meals program, but Catholic influence clearly undermined greater efforts at reform.

In Milwaukee, where Socialists increasingly served in all levels of government including the school board, Catholics also intensively opposed new school services. After the turn of the century the Social Democratic Herald wrote glowing articles on state maintenance in Europe, endorsed the labors of the Woman's School Alliance, and promised comprehensive nutritional programs for all children at municipal expense under the forthcoming Socialist state. The Federated Trades Council attacked those who claimed that intemperance among the working classes caused hungry children, and Meta Berger asserted that the causes of hunger were assuredly complex but essentially economic in nature. Still, Catholic organizations in 1915 effectively blocked permissive legislation for free textbooks and meals, berating the idea as Socialistic.[63] Besides denouncing labor unions, Archbishop Sebastian Messmer claimed that free textbooks, meals, and other services would destroy the family, establish "state paternalism, and...lead to advanced socialism."[64] Because of Catholic political influence, the Milwaukee school board did not adopt the work of the Woman's School Alliance until 1917, culminating nearly two decades of grass-roots struggle.

While Catholic opposition to social services generally took organized form, advocates of school meals faced an equally potent though less visibly united opposition by citizens who believed that nutrition was a private rather than a public responsibility. Some people endorsed parent education over the feeding of children, suggesting that it was not poverty but ignorance that caused parents to underfeed or misfeed their offspring. Other people denied that anyone was starving and argued that Socialists, women, and other reformers were sensationalists and municipal busy-bodies. When the Socialist working class and the Woman's School Alliance unsuccessfully attempted to receive an appropriation for school meals from the Board of County Supervisors in 1909, a Democrat responded that "women would go out loafing if their children were fed in school." A Republican at the same meeting asserted that "all mothers could easily provide meals for their children if they really loved them."[65] Such critics could not be swayed, either by appeals to efficiency or conscience, to vote in favor of a county appropriation for meals for the poor.

One of the biggest stumbling blocks to comprehensive nutritional programs in every city was the widespread belief that parents were responsible for their own children. A leading advocate of lunch programs summed up this feeling accurately in the Psychological Clinic in 1912:

> No one doubts that there is a close relationship between poverty and underfeeding--the terms are practically synonymous. Many persons, however, insist that the immediate cause of most of the underfeeding among the school children in American cities is not poverty but ignorance--that if the majority of incomes, slender as these are, were expended wisely, the children might be properly fed.[66]

Many well-educated individuals blamed the poor for their own predicament. A New York City physician, for example, bluntly told the American Medical Association that "in the majority of families among the poorer classes the food is poorly chosen, poorly cooked, and poorly served."[67] Other members of that staid organization throughout the Progressive era often asserted that the poor bought unsuitable food "not because these people have not enough money, but that they have no idea of what constitutes nutritious food."[68]

With often limited political support and opposition of this nature, grass-roots reformers had to work diligently to feed the maximum number of children. Like playgrounds, vacation schools, and other innovations, the meals were often popular with local parents and children even if they did not reach everyone in need. While chastizing those who feared that municipally-supported meals would lessen the child's initiative, the Central Labor Union of Toledo publicly applauded the work of women's clubs and the school board. "School authorities in this city are fully alive to conditions among working people," claimed the Toledo Union Leader in 1908. "The authorities are battling with hunger versus pride, and are attempting to solve the question of feeding children and at the same time not have them stamped as receivers of charity."[69] Nutrition advocates in Europe and America devised intricate methods to prevent children from feeling like objects of charity. In France, children separately entered booths, where they gave teachers a nominal sum to defray the costs of their meal if they were so able; those children without money still received a ticket for a meal, and presumably no one but the teacher knew which particular children could afford the price of a breakfast or lunch.[70]

Toledo and other cities employed different methods to try to protect children's pride, but undoubtedly many ragged youngsters were teased by other children and suspected of not having a penny for their lunch.

Because class prejudices were so potent, according to municipal Socialists, only a comprehensive and free meal program for all children would have eliminated the class stigmas that remained attached to school meals in the Progressive era. Yet the club women, urban radicals, and other grass-roots reformers who claimed that all children had a right to sufficient and nourishing food--and that the state should provide it--were like voices in the wilderness, far ahead of public opinion and unable to alter class biases in nutritional policy. The members of the Woman's School Alliance, the Women's Educational Club, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, and the Atheneaum nevertheless tried to aid all children in distress. More children came to their meals than they could possibly feed every year, and women again testified to their importance in Progressive social reform. Conflict between Catholics, efficiency advocates, Socialists and other interests on the grass-roots and national level guaranteed that the issue of perfecting children's health through the schools remained a pressing issue of the age. If meals were insufficient means to perfect children's health, perhaps medical inspection and other measures might bring relief to unhealthy and hungry scholars.

III

"Whatever else may be added to the three R's of the public schools," wrote the editor of Charities in 1906, "medical supervision is bound to be looked upon as fundamental." The editor dismissed critics who viewed medical inspection as an infringement of personal liberty by responding that "these people seem to overlook the spirit of our entire educational system, and that it is nothing more than reasonable, after forcing a boy to go to school, to see that he does the work with no serious handicap, and thus close one of the greatest doors to discouragement and dissatisfaction, leading to truancy."[71] Medical inspection became one of the most highly tauted panaceas of the Progressive era. It was variously endorsed as a way to eliminate "backward" and "dull" students, to ensure all children equal educational opportunities, to promote the vitality of the "race," and to make parents more responsible citizens. Medical inspection was also one of the most unpopular social services of the early twentieth century, leading to extensive civil disobediance including school boycotts and occasional riots. Deep divisions often separated home and school. People who labored to establish many different school innovations disagreed strenuously on the merits of many school health reforms.

Despite considerable popular opposition to medical inspection, the health movement flourished in American cities after the turn of the century. Boston had led the way by establishing the first medical inspection program in the United States in 1894. By 1900 eight cities in the country had followed its example. The greatest rate of growth of medical inspection, however, was between 1905 and 1910, when the number of urban school systems with medical inspection mushroomed from forty-four to three hundred and twelve.[72] As divisions of medical inspection and school hygiene organized in local schools, additional health personnel besides physicians joined the school staff. By 1910 dozens of nurses worked in the public schools, especially in the industrial Northeast. Roughly fifty cities had school dentists. Because of these trends a writer in American Education in 1911 stated that "there are now but few progressive cities in the country which have not established at least the nucleus of a system of medical inspection."[73]

The justifications for medical inspection resembled those popularized for the closely-related school meals movement. Poor health, it was argued, caused children to fail in their lessons. "The examination of school children with reference to their physical condition," argued a contributor to Education in 1905, "has led to the discovery of mental and physical ills which prevent the victims from making normal progress, and unfit them for classification with children sound and healthy."[74] According to the skeptical editor of the Nation, medical inspectors unanimously believed that poor health was "the real trouble in most cases which we inaccurately call stupidity, inattention, indifference to study, ill-temper, sullenness, malicious disobediance, and truancy."[75] Or, as one physician told a national charity organization in 1910:

> What can a child learn who is constantly annoyed by blurring in reading, by headaches, by sensitiveness to light or who is always fatigued by close attention of any kind? What can one accomplish whose blood is impoverished by deficient oxygenation and whose brain is anemic or inundated with unoxidized products?[76]

While assuming that sound minds could not coexist with unhealthy bodies and that wellness furthered academic excellence, school health advocates saw medical inspection as an educational and social cure-all. A physician in the Review of Reviews in 1907 claimed that since poor health led to truancy as well as "moral obliquity," health inspection would eliminate both maladies.[77] Speakers at N.E.A. meetings asserted that poverty and paupers would disappear if all diseases were diagnosed and then eliminated through proper treatment; perfect health produced hard-working citizens and maximized efficiency. And numerous writers repeatedly emphasized the basic need to elevate the "physical standard of the race," to improve "the efficiency of the race," and, as one analyst claimed in 1915, "to move in the direction of race betterment."[78]

Advocates of medical and dental inspection of urban school children openly preferred genetic over environmental interpretations of human development. Many of them believed in the superiority of the so-called Teutonic race and in the inferiority of the new wave of "swarthy" immigrants that migrated to American cities. Medical inspectors and health officers were often attracted to Theodore Roosevelt's theory of "race suicide"--the fear that new immigrant families had disproportionately large families compared to the older immigrant stock. Selective breeding, health reformers believed, might reverse this trend, but some also argued that even old stock citizens should have smaller families. As one author argued, a "few perfect children" of any ethnic origin were better than "a dozen unkempt degenerates, who add pathos to the struggle for existence, and who sink under the inflexible law of the survival of the fittest."[79] As Clarence Karier and other historians have argued, such logic helped promote eugenics-based sterilization laws for the poor in many states in the Progressive era, since it gave scientific legitimacy to many legislators and to their constituents who discriminated against the lower classes.[80]

Since health reformers often believed in the supremacy of genetics as well as ethnic determinants of school failure and success, they usually placed the blame for unhealthy children on the shoulders of immigrants and the poor. One commonly heard the statement that "children are allowed to suffer, not so much because medical treatment is costly, as because parents are ignorant."[81] Walter S. Cornell, the director of Philadelphia's medical inspection department and a renowned health reformer, longed for the day when the state would actively prosecute parents who chose to ignore the orders of local medical inspectors. Since poor parents were so ignorant of hygiene, sanitation, and the elementary principles of child care, according to a writer in the American Education, the state had to intervene in family life to rescue children from "ignorance on the part of parents. It becomes, therefore, the duty of the school authorities to see to it that such children are protected against influences that will seriously handicap them through life, often making them an economic burden to society."[82]

Armed with a set of questionable genetic theories and convinced of parental ignorance of medical knowledge, health reformers built a national network of information through dozens of articles, books, and pamphlets on the subject of medical inspection. Urban school systems gave increased attention to health care, and new medical personnel joined the school bureaucracy. The problem with the medical inspection movement was not that it overemphasized the existence of disease, for poor children still experience inadequate health care, considerable illness, and disproportionate school failure. Unfortunately, health reformers smugly assumed that health was the primary determinant of school success and that dental caries and adenoids produced problems like truancy, boredom, inattentiveness, and immorality.[83] Filling cavities, announced one writer, cured children's dullness. Certainly many children with poor teeth, adenoids, scabies, scarlet fever, and diptheria had an unequal chance to learn, as the health leaders claimed. They ignored the fact, however, that good health is only one factor in whether children excel in their studies and that many children who were hungry did well at school. Though the medical knowledge of the health reformers was limited (at least from a modern perspective), they condemned parents and other citizens who opposed them as ignorant, narrow-minded, and superstitious.

Medical inspection began in very similar ways in cities like Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City. Leading figures in local boards of health, medical societies, and dental associations typically pressured urban school boards to adopt systematic health inspection. Though some health reformers gave random examinations of school children in different kinds of neighborhoods, investigations usually centered in congested areas inhabited by the poorest working class populations. George Goler of the Rochester Health Department, for example, was a very active reformer. Along with the Rochester Academy of Medicine in 1901, he petitioned the board of education for permission to examine children in the poorest neighborhoods. The board initially rejected the program as exceeding its jurisdiction, but several years later nurses and other health staff were employed in the poorest Rochester schools.[84] The Rochester Dental Society inspected poor children's teeth for the first time in 1905, giving free exams and basic care for the "worthy poor." The Women's Educational and Industrial Union also contributed to the health movement. In 1909 it supported a handful of nurses in the schools. Soon tooth brush drills and updated lectures on hygiene and sanitation supplemented the school health program.[85]

Members of the local boards of health, together with philanthropic physicians and dentists, also inaugurated medical inspection in Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City after the turn of the

334

century. Toledo's dentists examined poor children's teeth for free as early as 1901, and women's clubs, liberals, and health advocates pressured the school board to hire its first medical inspector in 1910.[86] By then some Toledo dentists already operated a free dental clinic for poor children, and school nurses soon ministered to their medical needs. The process of school health reform in Milwaukee and Kansas City was almost identical. As a result of agitation by boards of health, physicians, dentists, and some women's organizations, these cities joined the hundreds of municipalities that established programs of medical inspection. And as the health staff grew in size, children in every school received annual physical and dental exams by nurses and physicians, who kept extensive records on the physical development of the thousands of individuals in these urban systems.[87]

Just as they had earlier predicted, medical inspectors often uncovered numerous unchecked diseases and physical defects that impaired the health and schooling of individual children. Even if one acknowledged that health reformers worked to publicize the "widespread" existence of disease, there was still considerable evidence that serious health problems afflicted many children. When contemporaries asserted that three out of ten children had serious, uncorrected vision problems and that seven out of ten needed dental work, few people disagreed with them. Careful investigation demonstrated that almost half of Rochester's public school children in 1912 required dental attention. Thousands more had various communicable diseases, enlarged tonsils, adenoids, and poor nutrition. Though the statistic seems exaggerated, one Rochesterian asserted that almost 1,300 children out of 15,000 examined in one study had some form of anemia.[88] An examination of Toledo's school children in 1911 similarly found thousands of children either in need of glasses, dental care, or nutritional aid.[89]

Detailed statistics gathered on children's health in many cities often demonstrated that it was greatly influenced by class background. Consider, for example, the Italian children at the Third Street School in Milwaukee, living in the impoverished

"Bloody Third." Their school usually led in the number of cases of impetigo, eczema, and other maladies, even though lice, scabies, and ringworm appeared in virtually every Milwaukee school.[90] In 1912, Milwaukee physicians discovered over 1,200 different cases of infectious diseases like measles, mumps, and chicken pox; they found 239 cases of diptheria and 317 cases of scarlet fever. Eye and skin diseases were very common. Nearly 3,000 cases of lice were also identified that year, along with ringworm, scabies, and other sources of children's discomfort. According to published reports in all of these cities, children's teeth were also in a deteriorating state. School dentists found plenty of diseased gums, various forms of pyorrhea, and hundreds of thousands of dental caries.[91]

Parental opposition to different aspects of medical inspection expressed itself in several ways. There were angry letters to the editor and to the school board and boycotts of the neighborhood schools. Parents often resented the insults hurled at them by health reformers, took pride in their own cures for children's diseases, and sometimes denounced the treatment their children received at school. Too often medical inspectors characterized all opponents as ignorant, narrow-minded people who interferred with those who wanted to perfect children's health. One New York City health officer said in 1914 that reformers encountered "a fusillade of prejudice, tradition and superstition, ignorance, distrust, apprehension, indifference, irresponsibility, poverty and antagonism."[92] Lewis Terman equated anyone who condemned school health work with 'sectarian' physicians, quacks, and patent-medicine vendors."[93] He accepted the principled opposition of Christian Scientists to medical treatment, but like other health advocates Terman believed that the uninformed public generally hindered medical progress.

Many parents distrusted the claims of health officers that medical inspection would cure every social ill, and they opposed any treatment of their children without their written permission. A school riot began in a Jewish neighborhood in New York City in 1906 when school physicians removed adenoids from the children.

A rumor spread through the neighborhood that children's throats were being cut, and "an excited mob demolished several windows and doors before the children could be dismissed."[94] During the same year 1,500 angry Italian mothers in Brooklyn fought police, pelted the local school with stones and other objects, and prevented any medical treatments. School inspectors lacked the legal power to force parents to provide their children with medical care or operations, but many parents disliked the notes children brought home urging specific treatments. When one health inspector complained to a mother about her son's body odors, she quickly told his instructor: "Teacher, Johnny ain't no rose. Learn him; don't smell him."[95] School baths only reached a tiny fraction of the school populations in any American city, and parents often rejected school interference in what they considered private family matters.

Even though parents were always ridiculed for opposing medical inspection and for endorsing Old World treatments for various illnesses, they often possessed a more complex understanding of social and educational problems than better schooled health officials. It must have raised more than a few eyebrows when Toledo's health commissioner proclaimed in 1907 that poor eyesight caused insanity. Or when the head of Rochester's health department called for "selective breeding" and confidently told one community group that most criminals had adenoids as children and breathed through their mouth, causing their abnormal social behavior. And school boycotts and popular opposition to modern "science" were almost predictable when local physicians on the school staff urged the teaching of eugenics in the classroom to educate everyone on the alleged inferiority of Poles, Italians, Slovaks, and other ethnic and racial groups.[96]

School inspectors scoffed at the "traditionalism" of immigrant groups, who ironically often had a more basic understanding of why some children disliked school or had health problems. School physicians were always certain that good health almost guaranteed academic excellence; they incorrectly believed that truancy, misbehaving, poor scholarship, and all of the other ancient evils of the schools would suddenly disappear if everyone followed their lead. Parents remained skeptical. One leading health advocate, Walter S. Cornell, reprinted the following letter from a parent in his seminal volume, Health and Medical Inspection of School Children (1912):

> We received the note from the Doctor and will say that we give [our son] medical attention when he needs it. We know that George has headaches but when he comes home from school he complains of a boy in the 3rd grade by the name of Andrew Aimeck who knocks him down and [sic] jomps on him. I wish you would give this your attention. I know boys are all alike but this boy is [sic] mutch bigger.[97]

Similar letters supposedly proved that parents were incompetent guardians. At the very least, however, they showed that Andrew Aimeck might cause headaches as well as other medical problems.

Some officials in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City faced numerous challenges to their authority. School physicians and nurses often received letters from parents that lambasted them for their arrogance, their snide remarks on children's physical state, and their cocksure belief that all problems stemmed from so-called physical imperfections. One child in Rochester was sent home by the school nurse in 1913 because he had a severe case of acne. His angry mother secured little Fred's immediate readmission:

> I don't see why he should stay at home all the pimples he has are on his face and I want them left just as they are if all the children and teachers that have pimples were [sic] send home there would be only a few left in school.
> Yours truly his mother.[98]

Christian Scientists in city after city took school boards to court, boycotted classes, and demanded medical freedom. And when medical inspection staffs and health reformers tried to vaccinate every child, it virtually guaranteed additional cultural and social divisiveness.

"The vaccinator," wrote an author in the Arena in 1907, "cares nothing for individuality, idiosyncracy, temperament, condition of life or age of his subjects."[99] As a result the vaccinator became one of the most hated men in American cities in the Progressive era. While some members of the medical community accepted the validity of Jenner's work with inoculation and the germ theory of disease, many physicians, healers, and urban citizens strongly opposed compulsory vaccination. Some parents might endorse checking children's teeth and inspecting their eyes, ears, nose, and throat, but anti-vaccination crusades united many citizens of different backgrounds and political persuasions. As one poet of the opposition proclaimed:

> Hail, O Shade of once great Jenner!
> Stalk forth from they place awhile,
> And kindly take the witness stand,
> Vaccination is on trial.[100]

The history of school vaccination is not a saga of how heroic physicians used the tools of modern science to rescue little children from disease and premature death. It is largely a tale of conflict between the school and the home, one of the most striking controversies of the Progressive era. Strong popular resistance to vaccination had been registered in America since the seventeenth century. Resistance in the twentieth century continued to hamper efforts by urban boards of health to establish basic school inspection programs. The working-class Kansas City Mail warned as early as 1893 that "a large number of people, respectable people, see that much evil results from vaccination. They see the state like a giant seize the little trembling babe and instill into its young life the germ of many diseases. These people see all around them persons afflicted with scrofulous and syphilitic diseases the result of vaccination with impure virus."[101] Many citizens opposed vaccination on religious grounds, viewing the body as a pure vessel which should be free from all foreign matter. Still others believed that vaccination caused tuberculosis, syphilis, and other diseases and that no rational person would willingly let a physician put small pox vaccine into the human bloodstream.[102]

A compulsory school vaccination law in New York in the 1890s faced considerable dissent in the Rochester schools. The school board unanimously opposed the law, noting that it was impossible to enforce. According to optimistic estimates, perhaps half of the city's children were already vaccinated, but thousands refused to comply with the law. The Democrat and Chronicle, which opposed compulsory but not voluntary vaccination, claimed that many parents feared that the virus "arouses diseases that have been lying dormant in the body."[103] George Goler and the health board threatened various legal actions against non-compliant parents and the school board. Opposition to the law nevertheless continued throughout the Progressive era. In 1912 the parents of a twelve year old girl even defeated the school board in a court case. The girl had been inoculated in compliance with the law, only the vaccination did not "take." Her parents pointed out that technically children only had to be inoculated: the law did not require that it was successful. Thousands of Rochester's parents refused to submit their children to the vaccinator, no matter what the law stated.[104]

A similar compulsory law existed in Ohio in the 1890s, producing considerable parental and ethnic opposition. The Turnverein passed a resolution against the law in 1897, and parents and children routinely boycotted neighborhood schools after the turn of the century. The health department had pitched battles in local Polish neighborhoods, where opposition to vaccination flourished on religious grounds. There was a so-called "police riot" in the Lagrange school district in 1902 when local officers protected health officers from residents who pelted the detested vaccinators. Golden Rule Jones, who basically subsisted on rye bread, nuts, and "natural" foods, opposed vaccination, and he was very popular with the Poles. He attacked the health department and defended the rights of immigrants to medical freedom. Jones said "plainly that he did not believe in kicking in doors...and did not approve of the rough handling" of local citizens.[105] Toledo's health commissioner called Jones and the Poles "ignorant" and vainly tried to make Catholic priests alter the medical beliefs of their parishioners.

The Toledo Evening Bee routinely asserted in 1903 that "the controversy over vaccination has lost nothing in bitterness in years, and that a great many very intelligent persons sincerely believe that it is worse than the disease."[106] Improper inoculations and unpredictable viral strains caused death in many cities, which only fueled popular resistance. Local chapters of the League for Medical Freedom formed in Toledo as elsewhere, and a city-wide school boycott against vaccination crippled the school system in 1914. In January the children held what the Toledo Blade called an "anti-vaccination strike."[107] Approximately 50 per cent of the high school class and 65 per cent of the elementary students boycotted classes rather than submit to vaccination. Once again, popular resistance made the law requiring vaccination unenforceable. At the Waite School, children followed their parent's orders and refused to leave their seats when school inspectors ordered them home. Meanwhile, parents from the Detroit district "accompanied their children to school and waited for inspectors to make their appearance."[108] Only when local authorities agreed to accede to parental wishes did classes across the city resume to their regular schedule--with the majority of children still unvaccinated.

Through boycotts, occasional riots, and threats of legal action, therefore, parents often intervened effectively in health work in the schools and confounded the efforts of many school health reformers. Parents continued to wield considerable influence in health education and care for their children. Parents were less successful, however, in preventing the use of psychological tests that were often promoted by health officers and other educational experts. Historians have demonstrated that these tests, which were used to track children into classes for the "feebleminded," "exceptional," or "sub-normal" as well as into vocational classes, were culturally biased against immigrants and the poor.[109] Although a detailed examination of the implementation and social uses of these tests is not feasible here, these innovations that were championed by Ayres, Terman, and others had profound influence in the treatment and education of urban school children. Tests went hand in hand with the eugenic theories on which much of the health movement rested, and they reflected the power of efficiency and scientific management theories in schooling after 1910. Like all innovations, tests produced cultural and class divisions in the urban schools, providing further examples of the conflictual basis of educational policy.

Not all of the health services that entered the urban schools had inhumane or undemocratic results. Parents adamently opposed many aspects of the school health movement, but undoubtedly many children benefited from medical and dental inspection in terms of personal comfort if not always in terms of academic success. Many children who could not afford glasses, who unknowingly had hearing problems, and who suffered from maladies from heart ailments to skin diseases profited from greater attention to their health. In Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, Kansas City, and other places school officials established classes for tubercular and anemic children. Here children were given (with their parents' permission) a special diet, individual attention, and adequate exercise. In "open air" facilities for tubercularly-prone youngsters, children dressed in eskimo suits and held their classes in open tents or in park pavilions. There teachers nurtured many children back to health, added stamina to bodies weakened by disease, and helped children return within a few months to the regular classroom. These experimental schools were extremely popular in many cities; Toledo's program had a long waiting list of poor, unhealthy children whose parents believed that the open air, rest, and exercise might cure their disease.

Study after study by layman and expert alike demonstrated the value of these programs in improving the health and at times the academic progress of individual pupils.[110] It is easy to dismiss all of the efforts of medical reformers as self-serving, ill-conceived, and unpopular, though undoubtedly many of their programs were so perceived by community groups. School health advocates promised too much, too soon, and with too little respect for the rights of many individuals. Their belief that proper health care would eliminate many "dull" and "backward" and "retarded" children was a simplistic assessment of the causes of school failure among the poor. By labeling children through biased psychological tests as backward, dull, feeble-minded, exceptional, or retarded, these reformers often created entire student populations who suffered under the stigma of being inferior, an enormous price for any child to pay for the advancement of science.

"Scientific authority is, in the nature of things, a most powerful instrument, whether it be established in error or in truth," asserted an opponent of vaccination in 1890. "Once established, the authority of science will be apt to secure absolute deference and obedience, most of all from the class who like to express their opinions in all matters non-scientific."[111] Parents did not always defer to the presumed wisdom of the health reformers, who continually regarded their own logic and theories as unimpeachable products of scientific research. Many citizens properly distrusted the eugenics and efficiency theories of these men of science, preferring Old World cures for their ailments and traditionalism over modernity. Incidences of tuberculosis in America declined by about 30 per cent in the Progressive era, but this did not result from vaccination or other medical inventions as far as histroians of medicine can determine.[112] And more medical inspection did not cause a reduction in truancy or dropout rates, end listlessness, boredom, "moral obliquity," or all the other evils perceived by the new medical mandarins.

Health reformers, like all people who try to improve the world, believed that the problem really rested with a lack of power, resources, and will. If only more money, more staff, and better methods of examining and treating children were found, they argued, surely the ancient problems of the classroom would be solved. Like many other social services in the Progressive era, however, health reforms were expensive and competed with all the other new programs that simultaneously entered the schools. Not every citizen or policymaker accepted the theories of health reformers, and neither did tax payers desire even heavier economic burdens. As a result, the basis for school inspection was laid in the Progressive era, but school hygiene departments were understaffed and small compared to the rest of the school bureaucracy.

Toledo, for example, had only five physicians and one nurse for thousands of students in 1917. The City Club of Milwaukee estimated in 1919 that the local hygiene department would have to double in size to be effective. And, in Kansas City, four nurses in the same year ministered to the needs of forty thousand children.[113]

Still, the testers and medical and psychological examiners had power disproportionate to their numbers. Just as new avenues in recreation, play, vacation activities, and community use of the schools opened in the Progressive era, so too did urban systems expand into other areas of social welfare. Like many social reforms of this period, health innovations were initially targeted for the children of the poor, competed for scarce funds, and contributed to enlarging the social functions of education. And, like every other innovation during these years, these programs became enmeshed in struggles between efficiency advocates and local interests that respected parental rights and community interests in formulating educational policy. Efficiency and democracy once again struggled for mastery in the schools.

World War I And The End Of An Era

Labor is opposed to war because war is opposed to the interests of labor and to the interests of the world's civilization. Labor fights in all wars. Labor suffers and perishes in all wars.
Kansas City Labor Herald, 1915

Toledo school buildings present scenes of an unusual industry these pleasant spring-like days. On the playgrounds and on the approaches to the buildings can be found groups of boys and girls knitting on sweaters, socks, and other Red Cross materials.
Toledo Blade, 1918

I

Richard Hofstadter once argued in The Age of Reform that "war has always been the Nemesis of the liberal tradition in America."[1] Whether war is actually an extension of the reform spirit or a reactionary tendency in opposition to it has been vigorously debated by many scholars, but it is clear that war has often followed crusades for domestic reform. The Civil War, for example, followed closely behind antebellum reform. Three decades of domestic reform that began in the 1890s also concluded with American involvement in World War I. The New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt ended with the prosecution of wars on several continents. And the great upsurge of recent domestic improvements best expressed in Lyndon Johnson's Great Society in the 1960s ended with American involvement in Vietnam. Although historians are still analyzing the exact interrelationships between domestic activism and militarism, every period of liberal reform seems to culminate in war and to shift attention away from solving domestic social problems.

By the time of American entry into World War I, grass-roots Progressivism had already spanned nearly three decades. The immediate origins of domestic reform began in the 1890s, when a number of different organizations and political leaders who were virtually unknown before then responded to the economic and social crises of the depression. By the turn of the century men like Victor Berger, Golden Rule Jones, Edward J. Ward, and many other individuals had already contributed much to the rise of a new social spirit. Helen Montgomery, Lizzie Black Kander, and Pauline Steinem--to name only a few of the new women who emerged on the urban scene--similarly organized with thousands of women across the nation to champion programs of social amelioration. And there were countless liberals, radicals, and ordinary citizens in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City who shaped educational reform in the Progressive era: the working-class poets who called for playgrounds and food for their children; the parents who refused to surrender their children to the vaccinator; the immigrants who attended the social centers; and the men and women who marched in Labor Day parades and prayed for justice in the market place and for political equality. How to improve the schools often became an all-consuming issue in these cities between the depression of the Nineties and the outbreak of World War I. Competing interest groups with varying perspectives on the state viewed the schools as a central institution for social progress. Liberals, conservatives, and radicals, of course, strenuously differed on who should direct the pace of change, who should benefit from specific reforms, and who should control the nation's educational institutions. Conflicts ran deep within local communities, and antagonistic community forces continued to strive to shape public policy during the war years.

By the time of America's involvement in the war, most of the important social services and urban educational reforms of the Progressive era had already been implemented. Although the funding of these programs was initially often meager compared to the total budget, and although innovations never reached every school child, school lunches, social centers, playgrounds, vacation schools, manual training and domestic science, medical and dental inspection, and other programs gradually affected urban schools across the nation. Psychological testing, vocational education, and special programs for the blind, deaf, crippled, and the feeble-minded also began. Educational extension and expansion were the trademarks of the Progressive era, as the schools broadened their influence in local neighborhoods and in the lives of area children.

The war did not eliminate any of these new programs. In the case of psychological testing and vocational training, the war actually accelerated the movement toward change. For example, the widespread use of psychological tests for military recruits and the Smith Hughes Act brought more attention to the value of testing and some financial support for vocational education.[2] But on the local level the war was less important for its effects on innovation than in how it noticeably divided grass-roots forces that had vied for influence in education since the 1890s. In many respects, World War I was almost as influential in smothering the spirit of community cooperation as the depression had been in nurturing it three decades earlier.

Grass-roots progressivism had never been a single, static entity in American cities. It gathered force over time, and third party efforts were more successful in some cities than in others. Many different community forces pressed for specific educational improvements after the 1890s. Women, for example, agitated for vacation schools, playgrounds, and other social services and used school reform as a way to expand their power beyond the confines of the home. Socialists disliked the non-radical aims of many of these liberal women, but they, too, endorsed similar municipal and state intervention wherever that seemed to offer immediate benefits to working-class and poor children. And countless other organizations, like local parent groups, civic leagues, and neighborhood associations contributed time, money, and effort to expand the social functions of urban education. Through the years liberals and radicals often had to set aside their differences temporarily when banding together to espouse a particular reform--as, for example, a demand for full funding of the schools, or a demand for a new social center. The war, however, divided these grass-roots groups more than any other event in local communities. The only other issue that had generated nearly as much division between these voluntary associations was the earlier movement for school board centralization and reorganization. But even then the differences between rival community interests did not produce the ugly scenes that marked the war at home between roughly 1915 and 1920.

Members of organized labor had warned for many years that involvement in war would turn contemporary minds away from domestic reform. When the schools became a domestic extension of the war abroad, laboring groups in particular dissented from infusing the schools with a militaristic spirit. Numerous labor unions in the Progressive era passed resolutions against American militarism and argued that wars were inimical to labor. A member of the Central Labor Union in Toledo, for example, warned in 1897 that "the jingoism which causes men to orate on Fourths of July and picture a condition of liberty and happiness which does not exist, is misleading to say the least. To blind the people to the abuses which exist is no panacea for the ills of humanity, and is the most cruel deception which can be practiced upon a people."[3] Many other workers agreed. Unions repeatedly attacked the "Flag Idiots" who waved the national banner on every patriotic holiday but who then ignored the need to improve social conditions for working people. According to many Socialist as well as non-Socialist working people, whenever military conflicts occurred between any nation, poor men fought the rich man's war.[4]

Trade union newspapers in Rochester, Toledo, and Kansas City as well as in other urban areas after 1914 attacked the preparedness movement which, they believed, would draw America into the war in Europe. Many articles in local working-class papers asserted that Wall Street and munitions manufacturers sought profits through war-making and that they posed a greater danger to American freedom and liberty than the Kaiser or any other European despot. No group, however, was as critical of preparedness activities as Milwaukee's Socialist working class; it especially denounced preparedness movements in the schools. The Federated Trades Council always asserted that wars primarily benefitted the world's capitalist ruling classes, who by necessity sought new markets for their goods while they simultaneously made working people become enemies on the battle field. The burdens of war, resolved the Council, "fall heaviest upon the working class, who have no interest in any such hostilities."[5] As a result, Socialist trade union members joined the Social Democrats in a large anti-war rally in Milwaukee in 1914, where they attacked all foreign policies that seemed to cause the nation to drift toward war.

When the ultra-conservative National Security League then asked the Milwaukee unions to march in a preparedness parade, the Federated Trades Council bluntly responded:

> We do not desire to lend ourselves to a movement to weaken democracy and enthrone plutocracy. Industrial plutocracy is as oppressive as the autocracy of kings... We are for the preparedness of a work day that will not exhaust the worker's vitality and a wage that will enable him to rear his

> children in comfort, without depriving his children of their childhood. We would prepare our nation's defense by keeping its children from being stunted in mine and mill and factory.[6]

Workers in other cities passed similar resolutions attacking the preparedness measures of Woodrow Wilson's administration, of local business leaders, and of elite members of the school board. Since numerous citizens tried to utilize the schools for military preparedness, Socialist and working-class groups who opposed the war and disliked war-related work in the schools engaged in one final battle over educational policy in this period.

One historian of the war and educational development has noted that the federal government and many other citizens consciously viewed the public schools as an instrument of national defense and preparedness. "Federal agencies, scores of patriotic societies, and many school systems proceeded to formulate courses in patriotism and to initiate war activities."[7] Schools increased their efforts to Americanize aliens through special evening schools and Americanization classes, thereby promoting "one hundred per cent Americanism." Children sold millions of dollars of war bonds and Thrift Stamps, marched in patriotic parades, and knitted clothes for the wounded. School gardens flourished and alleviated food shortages in many communities. And, to ensure that the entire school staff firmly supported the Allied cause, loyalty oaths became commonplace, as teachers were forced to testify to their patriotism. What a writer in the Toledo Union Leader called flag idiocy seemed to overwhelm public education.[8]

War-related work in the urban schools in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City was common after 1914. Labor unions and Socialists in particular opposed preparedness activities in education, while women's organizations and many other liberal organizations parted company with them and endorsed greater attention to national defense. For example, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, the City Federation of Women's Clubs of Toledo, the Woman's School Alliance of Milwaukee, and the Atheneaum of Kansas City all contributed to war garden work, knitted clothes for civilian casualties in Europe, and together with many parent organizations supported national efforts at preparedness.[9] After America finally entered the war, a number of women who believed that Wilson would press for full suffrage after the military activities ended became especially attracted to Red Cross work and other patriotic activities. The war, therefore, produced some highly congenial support for the war on the home front. At the same time, however, local communities witnessed vicious attacks on German culture and on pacifist sentiment and the ostracism of anyone who for matters of conscience opposed American involvement overseas. Much heralded as a "war for democracy" here and abroad, World War I had a devastating effect on many Americans' civil liberties.

Both the Toledo and Kansas City schools began a training program for military cadets in the high schools that was widely condemned by many unions and working people. Toledo's labor leaders in particular vigorously attacked the preparedness movement as well as military training. The Toledo Union Leader, the official organ of the Central Labor Union, had long opposed jingoism and American military involvement overseas. When several school board members in 1916 endorsed the Wyoming Plan--which was a voluntary military cadet program funded in part by the federal government--the Union vocally attacked the idea as undemocratic and contrary to the interests of labor. "We union men are the ones who will have to go out and shoulder the guns," claimed a union leader who attacked the business elites who sat on the school board.[10] Unions also criticized preparedness parades, urged neutrality in foreign policy, and stood opposed to the war and military training in the schools. As late as the spring of 1917, the 2,400 members of the Toledo Machinists Union unanimously opposed the establishment of the military draft.[11]

Unlike organized labor in Kansas City, which also opposed local preparedness movements, Toledo's workers had continually had some political representatives who were active in the peace movement. Golden Rule Jones, for example, was a major proponent of arbitration, belonged to national peace organizations, and denounced the Spanish-American War and imperialism generally. Labor also elected a perennial peace activist to Congress, Isaac R. Sherwood. A local Civil War hero, Sherwood nevertheless became a major Congressional opponent of World War I. Widely denounced by Toledo's Republican press and viewed by business leaders after 1915 as a coward and German sympathizer, he had considerable popular appeal in Toledo and for his principled stands received his largest electoral pluralities during the war years.[12] The Central Labor Union had been influential in establishing a municipal school for the working classes as part of the University of Toledo, and one of its leading radical professors, Scott Nearing, was also one of labor's leading anti-war heroes.

Nearing was a radical economist with Socialist and pacifist leanings. He had become nationally known when the University of Pennsylvania reportedly fired him because of his political views. While in Toledo he wrote a seminal essay on elite control of school boards by business interests. The Central Labor Union defended Nearing on numerous occasions for his pacifist and anti-big business beliefs, and the Toledo Union Leader continually wrote editorials in his behalf. In 1916, Nearing told the Women's Educational Club that war is "uncivilized and must be abolished."[13] "We need protection," he warned, "but not against Berlin, or London, or Paris, or Petrograd, but against Wall Street."[14] Socialists and working men who opposed the war gravitated to his side when several so-called community leaders attacked him as unpatriotic and demanded his removal from the university. At one meeting of several hundred members of the Commercial Club in 1917, Reverend Patrick O'Brien echoed the sentiments growing against Nearing when he proclaimed, "I feel tonight like taking him by the nape of the neck and hanging him to the nearest tree."[15] The priest never followed up on his threats, but the university regents soon dismissed Nearing despite the heated opposition they received from Socialists and organized labor.

Opponents to the war were often treated harshly by Toledo society and rebuked by school officials throughout these years. Superintendent William B. Guitteau, who was an Anglophile, promised citizens in 1914 that the schools would treat the war in the classroom "in a dignified, scholarly manner, just as we study the other great wars of history."[16] Within a few years, however, with continual prodding from the Commercial Club, Guitteau and the school board established military training as a high school elective, distributed copies of Wilson's Fourteen Points to every classroom, and forced every teacher to sign a loyalty oath. He also applauded the elimination of German language training. "War gardens" by the children were actively promoted to increase the food supply, women's patriotic leagues above all other groups were permitted to use the schools as social meeting places, and children were pressured to sell war bonds and thrift stamps and to march in patriotic parades.[17] Guitteau also became active in the local Committee of One Hundred, which was primarily comprised of businessmen and manufacturers who informed the federal government of suspected spies and otherwise tried to intimidate war resisters and pacifists. The Toledo Blade captured the local mood when it sensed a strong "growing demand for straight Americanism...We are through in this man's town with hyphenated citizenship."[18]

The Toledo school board could never have turned the schools into a domestic extension of the war without public support. All the while that many trade unions, pacifist organizations, and German-American leagues firmly opposed these new trends in school policy, other elements of society openly welcomed them. Toledo's large Polish community, for example, stood squarely on the side of the Allies, who presumably would guarantee the autonomy of Poland. Thousands of Poles marched through the Nebraska and Lagrange neighborhoods in loyalty parades in 1917. As the Toledo News-Bee asserted, "The spirits of Kosciusko and Pulaski, those Polish allies of our revolutionary fathers, marched thru the streets of Toledo...as a new testimonial of their pledge of Poland's heart and hand in America's fight for democracy."[19] Approximately one thousand Poles assembled in 1918 at the meeting house of local Polish Socialists, manhandled their opponents, and forced several of them to salute and kiss the American flag.[20]

The mayor vetoed requests of pacifist groups to meet in public buildings, a Socialist council member was removed from office, and Scott Nearing's home was raided by members of the Justice Department since he was regarded by the federal government as a German sympathizer and a spy.[21]

Socialists in many sections of the country were torn by whether or not to oppose the war, but the opposition against American involvement by Milwaukee's Socialist working class especially led to intense local conflicts and educational policy debates. Through their opposition to the war, the Milwaukee Socialists exposed themselves to an inordinate amount of criticism. They were denounced as "the local Bolsheviks" and "the trash of the world."[22] With a plethora of ethnic groups that inhabited Milwaukee whose homelands were involved in the war, any strong position on foreign policy was naturally destined to alienate specific groups of people. Yet the Socialists paid a heavy toll for their anti-war stand. "Everyone wanted to be a 100% American, and 100% citizens usually resorted to abusive unsigned letters," recalled Meta Berger.[23] She received a letter on school stationery that read: "Mrs. Berger, Why don't you hide your dirty head in shame and take your stinking sausage and go back to Germany."[24] It mattered little that Meta Berger, while of German parentage, was a native Milwaukeean and the daughter of a prominent school commissioner.

War hysteria overwhelmed Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Leader was banned from the mails by the federal government for its anti-war stand, and Victor Berger was sentenced to twenty years in federal prison under the Espionage Act; the conviction was later overturned by the Supreme Court. Paint was splashed on the homes of numerous pacifists; German-owned restaurants and businesses changed their names to indicate their loyalty; and innuendo and circumstantial evidence ruined many reputations. The City Club, comprised of reformers of varying political stripes, stopped debating war-related topics to preserve its organization.[25] More important, one radical remembered how the war erased much of the earlier progress the Social Democrats had made with the Milwaukee

Poles: "The Poles of South Milwaukee, many of whom we had captured for the Socialist Party, were now fighting the battles of Poland in the twelfth and fourteenth wards."[26] As in Toledo and Rochester, the Poles held huge loyalty parades, always denouncing the Socialists as traitors, atheists, and opponents of a free Poland. Numerous foreign language branches of the Social Democratic Party also wrote angry letters to party leaders, expressing their displeasure with the official anti-war position of the Socialists.[27]

Socialists and pacifists on the Milwaukee school board made numerous speeches during the war years in defense of free speech, foreign language training, and the right of citizens to dissent peacefully against established national policy. When it came to counting votes, however, theirs were cast on the losing side. Repeated complaints and opposition by anti-war activists did not prevent the schools from becoming a blatant instrument of preparedness and war. Lizzie Kander (a pacifist settlement worker), the handful of Social Democrats on the school board and, occasionally, the former Populist William Pieplow, were the only school officials to exercise any genuine opposition or restraint when confronted by patriotic pressure groups. The first important crisis occurred in June 1916, when a non-socialist member resolved that the board march in an upcoming preparedness parade. Meta Berger, ever tactful, divided the resolution into two sections; the board formally approved of the parade but did not require any members to participate.[28] Morris Stern, a Hungarian-born Socialist on the Board, angrily complained: "Our function is to administer the duties of the school board. No one can compel me to march in the parade. This is a personal matter."[29] Heated debates continually flared between the Socialists and their opponents on the board, and in the future the Socialists would not be so fortunate.

By early 1917, Meta Berger joined the Milwaukee Emergency Peace Committee, which tried to prevent navy recruiters from speaking to high school students. "I know that to oppose a measure as this is to lay oneself liable to being called unpatriotic, but I do not believe that our schools should be used for such purposes," she claimed in the Milwaukee Leader.[30] In March, Lizzie Kander joined her Social Democratic friends, arguing that "I wouldn't say anything against this if the whole thing of the navy wasn't to teach [children] to kill."[31] Their mutual effort to deter war recruitment in the schools failed. So did a number of other joint recommendations. They lost in an attempt to increase the compulsory school age from fourteen to fifteen, to hold young people from joining the service for an extra year; they lost when the children of the city marched in numerous patriotic parades, sold and purchased Thrift Stamps and Liberty Bonds, and operated victory war gardens. The social centers were declared "seditious and traitorous" by the non-socialists because of anti-war speakers sometimes heard there, and the schools were closed to all but patriotic organizations, presumably to conserve fuel to aid in the prosecution of the war.[32] The Socialists fought strenuously against these actions, won few victories, and were called traitors for their efforts.

The movement against free speech in the social centers was coupled with the abolition of foreign languages and the approval of loyalty oaths for teachers and even children. Numerous ethnic groups, especially the Germans, protested against the elimination of foreign languages, but every language except English was essentially eliminated by the end of the war. Ellen L. Minehan, a firebrand organizer of the Milwaukee teachers, had earlier joined the Federated Trades Council in denouncing Milwaukee's corporate tax-dodgers. Now she turned her sights from big business and attacked the German language and the Socialists. "The vigorous protests of Prussianized Germans against cutting down the teaching of the German language in the public schools...is a part and parcel of the pangermanic scheme to Prussianize the world," she declared before the Westminster Civic Club.[33] Like the Poles, she became an enemy of the Socialist working class.

The Social Democrats read long petitions favoring the retention of all languages, a useless enterprise in this conservative atmosphere. They also failed to halt an aggressive witch hunt for German sympathizers on the teaching staff undertaken by patriotic zealots on the school board and in the community at large. A fourth grade teacher was dismissed for allegedly urging the Kaiser to sabotage a local munitions plant. Arguing in her defense, the Socialists claimed that the teacher was indeed a pacifist and probably a single-taxer, yet had committed no crime. And there was no rule against the employment of pacifist teachers. As organized labor announced, "If so, under such a rule, Christ himself would have been barred from our schools, for He was, without question, the first of the pacifists."[34]

One abuse of civil liberties in the schools followed another in the atmosphere of the Red Scare. The rights of minorities and peaceful dissidents were consistently violated. Usually only the Socialists spoke out against these outrages. Aliens previously hired to teach in the schools were pressured to secure their citizenship papers immediately or face removal from their jobs. Loyalty oaths were passed from school to school for teachers and children to sign. Protests against such policies were consistently aired yet repeatedly ignored. One Socialist board member, Elizabeth Thomas, former secretary of the state party, complained of the ridicule heaped upon children who refused to sign a pledge because of parental wishes or personal desire.[35] Also, there was tremendous pressure "to make each school a 100% Red Cross school," wrote a fellow Socialist, "and this made a child's life miserable at that time. War hysteria is an awful thing."[36] It is so awful, in fact, that the Socialists in 1918 pledged themselves "to support every effort designed to eliminate reactionary tendencies and to make our school system a democratic institution."

Writing in this age of hysteria and patriotism, the Socialists proceeded with their resolution:

> Resolved, That we condemn the poisoning of the mind of the pupil with imperialism and militarism; the pernicious practice of using the school youth as a medium of spreading war propaganda; the practice of constantly begging for funds; the drilling of youth to act like puppets; and the brutal practice of subjecting

> a pupil, indicating a dislike for these practices, to ostracism.[37]

Despite such adversity, the Social Democrats still continued to endorse the enlargement of school programs and facilities, higher pay for teachers, and more attention to areas like public recreation. The abuses of civil liberties in Milwaukee were also not unheeded by many citizens. Later that year, the entire county ticket of the Socialists was elected, making it a strong minority party there. Victor Berger, already under indictment as an enemy of the state, was reelected to Congress though officials in Washington refused to seat him. The Republic County chairman only groaned at the thought of radical resurgence when he lamented, "Socialism, socialism seems to have taken hold of the people."[38]

The blatant abuse of power by the patriotic citizens on the school board and in the city may indeed have led to an unexpected backlash in the 1918 elections. But by and large the war had dealt the Socialists a heavy blow. The war years in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City led to an intensification of community conflict, especially when school superintendents and school boards in each of these cities openly utilized the schools for patriotic ends that were popular with some but not all citizens. Conflict and debate had shaped educational policy from the earliest days of the schools, but the war polarized community groups to an excessive degree. Since the early 1890s, different elements of the grass roots had struggled to initiate a number of innovations in the schools. Through civic cooperation on many issues, they fought for changes that promised to increase the usefulness and service of the neighborhood school. The war destroyed the spirit of community activism, for it undermined the faith in social cooperation that had once energized grass-roots Progressivism.

II

By the end of the war years, many of the grass-roots Progressives who first became active in municipal reform in the 1890s took stock of their accomplishments. "The expansion of the school system has been remarkable and the improvements in many respects noteworthy," asserted Milwaukee's school board President, William Pieplow, in 1919. "Forward--Wisconsin's motto--was the course followed by the directors and that is why Milwaukee is favorably recognized educationally today."[39] A Populist and a protege of Victor Berger in the Nineties, Pieplow became a conservative Republican after the turn of the century, when he began a seventeen-year tenure on the school board. Not every grassroots activist viewed the various innovations of the age with so great a sense of accomplishment, of course, but Pieplow accurately sensed that some momentous changes had transpired in his generation. In the Nineties the community activists fighting for the new education were outsiders, battling against an array of male ward politicians who disliked public meddling in their affairs. By the Twenties many innovations had been adopted in the schools, providing tangible proof of the new spirit of social reform that had captured the attention of many urban citizens.

An examination of the process and extensiveness of school innovation in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City yields many generalizations on the nature of school innovation in the Progressive era. In the first place, the Progressive period was clearly more than an age when "new middle class" school superintendents and centralized school boards dominated in the shaping of the urban school. Their power, of course, cannot be underestimated. Historians like David B. Tyack have demonstrated how centralizing administrative reforms hindered the flow of democratic and popular input into school policy at the turn of the century. But educational innovation in the Progressive era was more than simply a tale of how educational experts and elite school board members controlled the rest of the citizenry. Numerous voluntary associations of liberals and radicals competed for power and occasionally elected their representatives to the school board; they also contributed innovative ideas on social welfare and otherwise added to the pool of ideas that shaped school policy. Many community interest groups played aggressive roles in the history of urban educational policy making, and their story is a central and not incidental part of the larger process of social change in the period.

What grass-roots Progressives, especially radical reformers, contributed to the urban scene was social and political complexity and diversity that are often ignored in historical interpretations of early twentieth-century school reform. One can easily document the sometimes inhumane, prejudicial, and narrow opinions of the dominant socio-economic, political, and educational interests of the age: the elite school superintendents, the efficiency experts, the vaccinators, and the super-patriots who ran roughshod over the rights of less powerful citizens. There was always resistance to them, however, and the actions of dominant groups are always shaped to an important degree by threats against the established system of power. Historians have often called for a more "dialectical" interpretation of social change in education, but historians have nevertheless tended to emphasize the ideas and actions of dominant groups, acting as if no one else shaped the past, affected elite activity, or protested against undesirable social policy.

Because elite figures in history leave more literary records of their thoughts and activities than common folk, historians are often forced to depend on their opinions and appraisals of social life in the past. But aren't the views of ordinary parents and children who sent angry notes to the school nurse and boycotted classes as important as the annual reports of the local medical inspector? The clash of competing interests was apparent in every school innovation initiated at the turn of the century; to emphasize one group at the expense of opposing forces oversimplifies the past and drains it of important tensions and conflicts. It is clear, for example, that dominant interests often triumphed in the establishment of nutritional programs in the Progressive era: only when efficiency advocates saw school lunches as a form of capital investment and race betterment did they become interested in these Socialist-inspired programs to aid the poor. By establishing school meals as a form of municipal charity, school leaders reinforced class stigmas in social welfare and undermined radical objectives. Although this was true both in England and America, it is only part of the history of nutritional innovation. It is important to remember that some children undoubtedly benefitted from a school meal, or a dental examination, just as it is important to recall that some people were dissatisfied with theories of human capital investment and proclaimed that all children had a right to sufficient food as a matter of social justice.

Progressive school reforms such as these were not simply imposed on the so-called unsuspecting masses, a position often implied in social control models of education. Some people did not accept the existence of obvious inequalities in the schools and in the larger social order and vigorously demanded many improvements. Social change in the schools was a product of give and take; there was widespread cooperation within communities on some issues but widespread disagreement on others. European Socialists, for example, first agitated in the 1880s for free meals for all school children. The subsequent intervention of elite interests in the formulation of school policy meant that Socialists never shaped educational innovation exactly as they pleased. Programs were created but not for every child, and they were never free except for the very poor. But the programs' very existence depended on Socialist initiative in the first place, even if dominant interests guaranteed that radicals only achieved limited victories. The nature of almost every social service innovation that entered the schools was determined by the tensions that divided different community groups and that divided their representatives and elected school officials. To leave either dominant or subordinate forces out of the history of social change in education ignores the conflictual process from which many different innovations emerged.

The interplay between many contrasting forces therefore shaped the social history of urban education in the Progressive era. On the one hand, large numbers of men and women believed in the efficacy of reform at the turn of the century, agitated for school innovations as well as other changes to achieve social progress, and made the neighborhood school a central institution in larger social reconstruction. Through its supporting institutions, the state seemed to offer relief and social amelioration. But certainly not all reformers agreed on which specific educational changes were desirable, who should control public education, and whether educational reform by itself would cure most of society's ills. After the depression of the Nineties, for example, many liberal women wanted to increase their influence over children's welfare and to augment their power generally in the city. That almost inevitably led them to the schoolhouse door. Once there, however, they encountered numerous other reformers who also saw schooling as a mechanism for social improvements and a way to help maximize their influence in the community. There were visionaries like Samuel M. Jones, who believed that school playgrounds and other innovations would teach human brotherhood and cooperation and help institutionalize the Golden Rule. There were parent groups and kindergarten teachers who tried to bridge the gaps that separated home and school. And there, too, women also met the trade unions and Socialists like those in Milwaukee, who saw schooling as a potential aid in social amelioration but also as currently a support of capitalist domination. Instead of a community chorus for reform there sometimes seemed to be a babble of voices.

What all of these grass-roots forces contributed to the twentieth century, however, was a spirit of civic activism and faith in the power of men and women to change institutions peacefully for human betterment. They realized that public apathy could paralyze the social spirit. Whether they quoted Marx or Jesus, many Progressives spoke out against social injustice even when they realized that the road to social improvement was winding, hazardous, forever full of unexpected impediments. None of the most radical reformers ever witnessed the establishment of a society based on the Golden Rule or saw the redistribution of national power and resources among all citizens. Victor Berger's prediction in the mid-Nineties that Milwaukeeans in 1945 would be living in a Socialist state was unfulfilled. Yet such faith and hope typified the Progressive generation, and men and women like Victor and Meta Berger for all their faults held out the prospect of a more just social order. By the end of the war, elites dominated on the school boards of many cities. Still, that never deterred radical reformers from continuing their struggle against the powerful in the name of the powerless.

Schooling in Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City in the Progressive era was the product of the intense opposition of contradictory forces: the movement for administrative centralization and the call for local representation, the rise of expert supervision versus the interest of parents and lay people in schooling, the existence of male educational leadership and the challenge of the new woman, and the widespread struggles between proponents of efficiency and democracy. Business efficiency interests often triumphed in the schools, but not without a fight, and never totally. School boards indeed became Mutual Admiration Societies because of school board centralization, but liberal women and Socialist representatives in some cities exemplified the spirit of dissent against the status quo common for the times.

Similarly, voluntary associations forced many new social service programs onto the schools, programs which were once privately funded, "experimental" innovations like playgrounds and penny lunches. Dominant political interests that controlled the schools, of course, controlled these and other programs and blunted their potential as a way to transform education. Hence social centers began, just as numerous grass-roots agitators desired, but free speech was denied. Cities increasingly funded lunch programs, playgrounds, and other welfare reforms, but they failed to reach every child in need. And, during the war years in particular, conservative business elites on the school boards encouraged war hysteria, denied civil liberties to teachers and other citizens, and demonstrated the power which centralized control brought to those in office.

More effective community control over urban educational policy would have required a more democratic governing structure.

That, however, was impossible after Good Government forces and some liberal Progressives had centralized school boards after the turn of the century. A ward-based structure would not have guaranteed that all classes, sexes, races, and ethnic groups would have fair representation on the school board. This never existed before the elimination of ward-based school boards in many cities, and many ward leaders resisted school innovation, endorsed hard line pedagogical ideas, disliked meddling women and parents, and gave little power to teachers, who lacked tenure and served at the pleasure of local elites. But if the ward structure never guaranteed enlightened leadership, the at-large structure almost guaranteed elite dominance. Many local neighborhood interests suffered when the business efficiency wing of municipal reform movements ushered "a better class of men" into power.

Radical reformers at the turn of the century realized that the actions of the centralizers were not irreversible. History, they believed, would be shaped by those who organized most effectively and offered the people relief from the prevailing social order. Groups like the Milwaukee Socialists, for example, understood that at-large elections denied many citizens adequate political representation, that non-partisanship was impossible since society was divided into social classes, and that centralization benefitted the most wealthy and influential citizens. Efficiency, they realized, would have to be sacrificed if power shifted back closer to local neighborhoods, for representative democracy could only be achieved if citizen participation and parental input into the educational process became widely accepted and the power of school officials thereby reduced. The failures of decentralization plans in large cities in the recent past highlight the problems that communities will face in future struggles. It remains to be seen whether localism will receive the attention it deserves in a society dominated by corporate interests and centralized power.

One legacy of radical thinking of the Progressive era was the belief that the contradictions of progress and poverty at key points in history would inspire large numbers of people to unite for social reconstruction. Although it was of little immediate consolation to the victims of various forms of discrimination, the Milwaukee Socialists in particular placed their struggles against corporate capitalism in broad historical perspective. By the 1920s they realized that their early bouts against the prevailing economic, political, and educational system were necessary and worthwhile activities and provided a foundation for more community action in the future. The spirit of hope and struggle never really died in Milwaukee and in other cities, and many radical reformers attempted to remind contemporaries that the struggle for social justice transcended their own age.

When the Great Depression sent the nation into near chaos, the Socialist working class of Milwaukee pointed with pride to their activism in the past and remained confident of the future. "Our influence has created a real civic heart and consciousness," claimed the local radicals in their municipal campaign of 1932. "The period since the election of the first Socialist mayor has been the era of Milwaukee's greatest progress." And, they added, the partisans of the proletariat must aid the age-old struggle "in meeting oppression, wiping out poverty, and establishing industrial democracy, in place of the selfish, inhuman capitalist system of exploitation."[40] Written at a time of economic and political despair, these words captured the activist spirit of grass-roots reform.

"Notes to Introduction"

[1] Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1960), p. 14.

[2] The voluminous literature on the history of Progressive school reform will be cited in many of the forthcoming chapters of this study. Because of the extensive documentation in the remainder of this study, citations in this introduction have deliberately been kept to a minimum.

[3] Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Vintage Books, 1961).

[4] Paul C. Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978).

[5] Studies on the Northeast and Massachusetts in particular revitalized the history of education in the last two decades. See especially Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968); Carl F. Kaestle, The Evolution of An Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973); Stanley Schultz, The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Marvin Lazerson, Origins of the Urban School: Public Education in Massachusetts, 1870-1915 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971); and Carl F. Kaestle and Maris Vinovskis, Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

"Notes to Introduction to Part I"

[1] Toledo Blade, 5 June 1855.

[2] See especially David Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971).

[3] David B. Tyack, "The Spread of Public Schooling in Victorian America: In Search of an Interpretation," History of Education 7 (1978): 174. Other provocative and stimulating studies that highlight the differences between the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of school reform are by Albert Fishlow, "The American Common School Revival: Fact or Fancy?" in Henry Rosovsky, ed., Industrialization in Two Systems (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966); John W. Meyer, et. al., "Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930," American Journal of Sociology 85 (November 1979): 591-613; and Carl F. Kaestle and Maris Vinovskis, Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

[4] Historians of juvenile justice have long noted the importance of parens patriae. As historian Steven L. Schlossman has written: "A medieval English doctrine of nebulous origin and meaning, parens patriae sanctioned the right of the Crown to intervene into natural family relations whenever a child's welfare was threatened." Applied first in cases dealing with "the property of well-to-do minors," it received a much "broader construction" in England and America in the nineteenth century. See Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 8; David J. Rothman, Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980); pp. 212, 221; Joseph M. Hawes, Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth-Century America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 59, 171; and Robert M. Mennel, Thorns & Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940 (Hanover, New Hampshire: The University Press of New England, 1973).

367

"Notes to Chapter 1"

[1] *Toledo Blade*, 9 May 1854. Basic sources on time discipline include E. P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," *Past and Present* 38 (December 1967): 56-97; and Herbert G. Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," *American Historical Review* 78 (June 1973): 531-87. Also see Gutman's book, *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976); and Alan Dawley, *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976).

[2] *Toledo Board of Education Minutes*, 16 May 1865.

[3] Whig ideology and school reform are analyzed in Robert L. Church and Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States* (New York: The Free Press, 1976), Chap. 3; and David Nasaw, *Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 31-32, 40-43. Another confirmation of the salient role of the Whigs in public school development is by Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979). "Business and professional men tended to be Whigs," Walker notes, and "observers at the time usually assumed that people with greater income, education, and respectability were more likely to be Whigs." Ralph Waldo Emerson aptly described the Whigs as follows: "The active, enterprizing, intelligent, well meaning and wealthy part of the people..." (p. 13). Although Howe argues impressionistically that men from all occupations joined and voted for the Whigs, his study primarily revolves around the biographies of elites. He does, however, carefully distinguish the Whigs and their view of government and internal improvement from the opposition Democrats.

[4] An outdated historiography of American education which interpreted the rise of common schooling as a reaction to working-class demands is surveyed in Jay M. Pawa, "Workingmen and Free Schools in the Nineteenth Century: A Comment on the Labor-Education Thesis," *History of Education Quarterly* 11 (Fall 1971): 287-302. Michael B. Katz almost single-handedly changed our historical understanding of common school ideology in *The Irony of Early School Reform* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), though I have tried to write a more dialectical analysis of parents and elite members of society. Katz occasionally interprets working-class opposition to secondary education as opposition to education generally. Less complimentary appraisals of Katz are found in Diane Ravitch, *The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), pp. 116-26; C. A. Bowers, "Educational Critics and Technocratic Consciousness: Looking into the Future with a Rearview Mirror," *Teachers College Record* 80 (December 1978): 277; and Maris A. Vinovskis, "The

Politics of Educational Reform in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts: The Controversy Over the Beverly High School in 1860" (Washington, D.C.: Unpublished N.I.E. Report, 1980).

[5] Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Water-Power City 1812-1854 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945), pp. 264-66; and A. Laura McGregor, "The Early History of the Rochester Public Schools," in The History of Education in Rochester, ed. Blake McKelvey (Rochester: Published by the Rochester Historical Society, 1939), pp. 45, 50.

[6] Toledo Blade, 12 May 1849. For more on internal improvements, see Howe, Political Culture, pp. 16, 36. Instead of viewing schools primarily as avenues of opportunities (as the Democrats did) "Whigs correctly perceived that the diversified, capitalistic social order they wanted required a population that was literate, ambitious, and disciplined."

[7] Toledo Blade, 4 Sept. 1848; and McKelvey, The Water-Power City, p. 99. During these years, Jesup W. Scott, a nationally prominent urban booster, predicted that Toledo would be the largest city in the world by the year 2000. See Randolph C. Downes, Lake Port (Toledo: The Toledo Printing Co., 1951), p. 5; John H. Doyle, A Story of Early Toledo: Historical Facts and Incidents of the Early Days and Environs (Bowling Green, Ohio: C. S. Van Tassell, Managing Publisher, 1919), p. 105; and Jessup W. Scott, "Our Cities in 1862 and 1962," Hunt's Merchant Magazine 47 (November 1862): 404-08.

[8] Quoted in Bayrd Still, Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), p. 108. "No city in the Union offers better, safer, or more remunerative employment for capital, than Milwaukee," clained a booster in "Milwaukee, Wisconsin," Hunt's Merchant Magazine 41 (September 1859): 314.

[9] Still, Milwaukee, pp. 84-85, 216-17. Useful sketches of King are provided in Frank A. Flower, History of Milwaukee, Wisconsin 2 vols. (Chicago: The Western Historical Company, 1881), 1: 623; Jerome A. Watrous, ed., Memoirs of Milwaukee County 2 vols. (Madison: Western Historical Association, 1909), 1: 97-98; General Charles King, "Rufus King: Soldier, Editor, and Statesman," Wisconsin Magazine of History 4 (1920-1921), pp. 371-81; and Joseph Schafer, "Origin of Wisconsin's Free School System," Wisconsin Magazine of History 9 (1925-1926), p. 39. In another context, Steven L. Schlossman underscores the political and educational influence of King and the Sentinel in Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 87-88.

[10] *Journal of Commerce*, 8 Oct. 1869.

[11] On Van Horn see, for example, Frank A. Fitzpatrick, "James M. Greenwood: An Appreciation," *Educational Review* 48 (October 1914): 289; R. Richard Wohl and A. Theodore Brown, "The Usable Past: A Study of Historical Traditions in Kansas City," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 23 (May 1960): 239-40; and Donald Bright Oster, "Community Image in the History of St. Louis and Kansas City," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1967, pp. 41-42. Van Horn's civic activities are chronicled in A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Dorsett, *K. C. A History of Kansas City* (Boulder, Colorado: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 11-16.

[12] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 19 Apr. 1867.

[13] *Toledo Blade*, 28 Mar. 1853. The same myth was perpetrated in the 1840s by the Milwaukee Sentinel, which is quoted in Conrad E. Patzer, *Public Education in Wisconsin* (Madison: Issued by the State Superintendent, 1924), p. 45.

[14] Most local studies interpret the rise of formal school systems as the flowering of democracy. See, for example, McKelvey, *The Water-Power City*, pp. 263-66; Downes, *Lake Port*, p. 239; William George Bruce, ed., *History of Milwaukee City and County* 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1922), 1: Chap. 36; W. H. Miller, *The History of Kansas City* (Kansas City: Birdsall & Miller, 1881), pp. 235-36; and William E. Parish, *Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1965), p. 148.

[15] McKelvey, *The Water-Power City*, pp. 263-66; and idem, "Rochester's Public Schools," *Rochester History* 31 (April 1969): 2-3. Cf. McGregor, "The Early History of the Rochester Public Schools," p. 45.

[16] The significance of these men was underlined in an essay by D. F. DeWolf, "Toledo," in *Historical Sketches of Public Schools in Cities, Villages, and Townships in the State of Ohio* (Columbus: Ohio State Centennial Educational Committee, 1876), p. 4; in *A History of Education in the State of Ohio* (Columbus: Published by the General Assembly, 1876), p. 178; and in John M. Killits, ed., *Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio, 1623-1923* 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1923), 1: 379. The activities of these men can be traced in Clarke Waggoner, ed., *The History of Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio* (New York: Munsell & Company, 1888).

[17] James S. Buck, *Pioneer History of Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: Milwaukee News Company, 1876), p. 214; Still, *Milwaukee*, pp. 114,

170, 179, 183, 248-49; and Patrick Donnelly, "The Milwaukee Public Schools," in The Columbian History of Education in Wisconsin ed. John William Stearns (Milwaukee: Press of the Evening Wisconsin Company, 1893), pp. 439-40.

[18] Howard Louis Conard, ed., History of Milwaukee 3 vols. (Chicago: American Biographical Publishing Company, 1896), 1: 456-57; 2: 386-87; Watrous, Memoirs, pp. 183-84, 277-78; Still, Milwaukee, pp. 76, 134. On these leading figures in school reform, see Donnelly, "The Milwaukee Public Schools," pp. 439-40. Lloyd P. Jorgenson praises the consolidation movement in Milwaukee in The Founding of Public Education in Wisconsin (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956), pp. 47-48.

[19] First Annual Report of the City of Kansas (Kansas City: Bulletin Steam Book & Job Printing House & Book Bindery, 1871), p. 4; Roy Ellis, A Civic History of Kansas City, Missouri (Springfield, Mo.: Press of Elkins-Swyers Co., 1930), p. 192; Glen Lester Hanks, "The Development of Public School Finance in the Kansas City School District," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1953, p. 38; and Brown and Dorsett, K.C., pp. 84-85. In Toledo as in Kansas City, praise was bestowed upon the "influential citizens" who finally became interested in establishing a system of schools. See the Toledo Blade, 1 Dec. 1848. (Hereafter all city school reports will be cited in abbreviated form as, for example, Kansas City School Report, 1871.)

[20] Milwaukee School Report, 1849, p. 10. Ralph Glauert has documented the belief in antebellum Missouri that good schools attracted settlers and boosted trade. See "Education and Society in Antebellum Missouri," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1973. The same argument was used by booster editors in Kansas City during the Civil War, as demonstrated in Hanks, "The Development of Public School Finance in Kansas City," p. 31.

[21] Toledo Blade, 24 May 1855.

[22] McEwen & Dillenback, Kansas City in 1879 (Kansas City: Press of Kamseg, Millett, & Hudson, 1879), p. 51. The Kansas City Times argued in 1875 that "every city in the Union has its graded schools. Kansas City, proud of her rapid growth, material prosperity, railroad communications, markets, manufacturers, and other industries, could not, dare not, neglect her children and their culture." See the Times, 10 Jan. 1875.

[23] Kansas City School Report, 1880, p. 7; and Kansas City School Report, 1887, p. 6; and Kansas City Times, 21 Oct. 1884. In Milwaukee it was earlier asserted that the schools "serve as an

index of the growth and prosperity of the city.' See the *Milwaukee School Report, 1874*, p. 54.

[24] *American Industry and Manufacturers in the 19th Century*, vol. 16 (Elmsford, N.Y.: Maxwell Reprint Company, 1970), pp. 996-1003. For useful discussions of local commercial development, consult McKelvey, *The Water-Power City*, Chap. 4, 8; idem, *Rochester: The Flower City, 1855-1890* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), Chap. 4, 8; Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millenium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), Chap. 1; Randolph C. Downes, *Canal Days* (Toledo: The Toledo Printing Company, 1949), Chap. 1, 2, 8, 11; idem, *Lake Port*, Chap. 3-7; Still, *Milwaukee*, Chap. 3; Bruce, *History of Milwaukee*, 1: Chap. 17-21; and Dorsett and Brown, *K. C.*, Chap. 3.

[25] *Kansas City Times*, 7 Sept. 1879.

[26] "Relations of Parent and Teacher," *New England Journal of Education* 6 (August 30, 1877): 91.

[27] Asa D. Lord, "Education in Ohio," *The Ohio Journal of Education* 3 (September 1854): 258. The previously quoted phrases are from *Rochester School Report, 1884*, p. 83; *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 6 Feb. 1871; and *Kansas City School Report, 1884*, pp. 75-76. Superintendent R. D. Jones of Rochester claimed that "when a child, whose proper training has been neglected and has...acquired vicious habits, comes within the restraints of the school, a check is at once thrown around him, which, ere long, works his reform." See the *Rochester School Report, 1852*, p. 28.

[28] *Rochester School Report, 1862*, p. 44. The citations on the viciousness of some parents and children seem endless. The following view was typical: "Many of the parents of the children in our public schools are ignorant and move in the lowest paths of life. To such the teacher often times seems a usurper, an invader of home rights." See Ellen C. Jones, "Relations of Parent and Teacher," *Wisconsin Journal of Education* 7 (October 1877): 436. This entire chapter has benefitted enormously from the ideas of Carl F. Kaestle, especially "Social Change, Discipline, and the Common School in Early-Nineteenth Century America," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 9 (Summer 1978): 1-17. It contradicts the consensus perspectives in Barbara Finkelstein, "In Fear of Childhood: Relationships Between Parents and Teachers in Popular Primary Schools in the Nineteenth Century," *History of Childhood Quarterly* 7 (Winter 1976): 321-35; and in Geraldine Joncich Clifford, "History as Experience: The Uses of Personal-History Documents in the History of Education," *History of Education* (1978): 194-95.

[29] *Toledo Blade*, 15 June 1849; 16 June 1849; and 12 Sept. 1849.

[30] *Rochester School Report, 1849*, pp. 3-4; *Rochester School Report, 1855*, pp. 6, 15-16.

[31] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 10 June 1845.

[32] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 22 Dec. 1869.

[33] *Rochester School Report, 1847*, p. 19; and *Rochester School Report, 1859*, pp. 32-33. The school reports for other cities are filled with similar pleas, usually with the aim of improving school attendance and the manners of children. Toledo's school superintendent, for example, argued that "attendance and discipline cannot be maintained without the hearty co-operation of parents." See the *Toledo School Report, 1888*, p. 48. Superintendent James Greenwood of Kansas City continually blamed parents for the lax habits and tardiness of children. A typical reference appears in the *Kansas City School Report, 1885*, pp. 68-73.

[34] *Rochester School Report, 1845*, p. 18.

[35] *Rochester School Report, 1852*, pp. 31-32. "How few of those parents, who complain because their children learn no faster, ever visit the school-room!" stated one Milwaukeean. "They accuse the teacher of incapacity, and encourage indolence and insubordination in their children thereby." See J. L. F. "A Word to Parents," *School Monthly* 1 (August 1868): 398. For further complaints on the insufficient visitation of parents, consult the *Milwaukee School Report, 1872*, pp. 21-22; and the *Milwaukee School Report, 1874*, p. 87. In the last cited source, Superintendent Lau urged parents to hold the office of the teacher "sacred" and emphasized the need of home and school cooperation. As he put it, "If, while one sows good seeds the other sows tares, a worthless harvest must be the result."

[36] *Rochester School Report, 1862*, p. 43.

[37] *Rochester School Report, 1884*, p. 37. In 1881, the Milwaukee School Board resolved that "as our Public Schools depend for their support upon the will of the people, it would greatly enhance their popularity and success if the parents and guardians of children... would take a more active interest by frequently visiting these institutions and ascertaining by personal examinations the character and qualifications of the teachers and the actual progress being made by the pupils in their several studies." Quoted in the *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board*, 1 Nov. 1881.

[38] *Toledo Blade*, 2 Mar. 1853.

[39] Toledo Blade, 2 June 1854. The introductory article in the magazine stated that "during the past year, not one parent in thirty has visited the schools in which their children's character for life, and for eternity, are forming. The exceeding irregularity of many pupils...indicates that their parents are not fully aware of the evils attendant, and consequent, upon such a course." It was commonly assumed that tardiness in youth led to criminality in adulthood.

[40] Toledo School Report, 1888, p. 48.

[41] "Public High School Education," School Monthly 1 (January 1868): 168. The nurturing, benevolent role of the state was an integral facet of common school ideology. On the local level, see the Rochester School Report, 1865,p. 12; and the Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 20 Feb. 1850. An early memorial on Rochester schooling to the state legislature spoke of the state's "fostering hand." See the Petition of a Committee Appointed by the Citizens of Rochester to Memorialize the Legislature on the Subject of Our Common Schools. Assembly Document No. 387, in Legislative Documents of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, 1830 (Albany: E. Croswell, 1830), p. 7.

[42] Rochester School Report, 1844, p. 16.

[43] Toledo School Report, 1888, pp. 48-49.

[44] "What is the Use?" Wisconsin Journal of Education 10 (November 1880): 491.

[45] Rochester School Report, 1885, p. 88; Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 22 Dec. 1862; 21 Sept. 1863; 17 May 1866; 10 Sept. 1869; 11 Jan. 1871; 5 Nov. 1872; 23 Sept. 1873; 22 Sept. 1874; 6 Oct. 1874; and 13 July 1875; and Kansas City Times, 3 Nov. 1882.

[46] Rochester School Report, 1867, p. 35. Soon after, the local superintendent chastized parents for the tardiness of their children, for "so long as parents will either 'wink' at these miserable habits in their children, or excuse them time out of number, this must remain as a 'vexed and vexing question.'" See the Rochester School Report, 1870, p. 38.

[47] Kansas City School Report, 1877, p. 50.

[48] Kansas City Star, 1 Aug. 1914; and Kansas City Post, 1 Aug. 1914. For sketches of Greenwood, read Wilfred R. Hollister and Harry Norman, Five Famous Missourians (Kansas City; Hudson-

Kimberly Publishing Company, 1900), pp. 265-333; Carrie Westlake Whitney, Kansas City, Missouri, Its History and People 1808-1908 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1908), 2: 238-43; "Dr. J. M. Greenwood," Missouri School Journal 31 (September 1914): 401-06; and Henry Warren Button, "Committee of Fifteen," History of Education Quarterly 5 (December 1965): 258.

[49] James M. Greenwood, "How I Became a 'School-Keeper,'" Journal of Education 25 (March 10, 1887): 148.

[50] Kansas City School Report, 1876, p. 18. Greenwood later argued that "everyone is sparing of time except the hopelessly ignorant. 'Punctuality' has passed into a proverb as 'the politeness of the great.'" See Kansas City School Report, 1889, p. 77.

[51] Toledo School Report, 1882, p. 25.

[52] Kansas City Times, 4 Mar. 1881. School officials prayed for the time when perhaps only fifty children would occupy a single primary class, as revealed in the Milwaukee School Report, 1865, p. 8.

[53] Kansas City Mail, 10 Oct. 1894.

[54] This is based on the reading of numerous corporal punishment cases in the minutes, proceedings, and annual reports of the cities in this study. See also Mark Van Pelt, "The Teacher and the Urban Community: Milwaukee, 1860-1900," M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1978, p. 40.

[55] Kansas City School Report, 1875, pp. 48-49, Rule 64. The Kansas City School Report, 1880, for example, listed only 121 cases of corporal punishment, though statistics were always poorly gathered from year to year. Here the majority of cases were also directed toward black children, even though they were a much smaller percentage of the population than whites.

[56] Rochester School Report, 1873, pp. 52-54. The Superintendent claimed that "many a rebellious spirit is doubtless kept in respectful subordination under the fear of the rod."

[57] Milwaukee School Report, 1861, p. 32. A few pages earlier it was stated that "many parents send children to school without a single book, slate or map." In endeavoring to borrow these materials during the class hour from friends, children then engaged in "chatter and indolence," becoming "perfect pest[s]." Proof of parental conflicts over uniformity in textbooks is also revealed in Dorothy S. Truesdale, "The Three R's in Rochester:

1850-1900," in McKelvey, *The History of Education in Rochester*, p. 193.

[58] Ibid.

[59] On the drive for uniformity, see *Rochester School Report, 1849*, pp. 3-34; *Rochester School Report, 1855*, p. 16; *Rochester School Report, 1859*, p. 10; Dorothy S. Truesdale, "The Three R's in Rochester, 1850-1900," in McKelvey, *The History of Education in Rochester*, p. 106; *Toledo Board of Education Minutes*, 17 Mar. 1851; 22 Aug. 1864; DeWolf, "Toledo," pp. 8-9; *Milwaukee School Report, 1861*, p. 32; *Milwaukee School Report, 1868*, pp. 56-57; *Milwaukee School Report, 1869*, p. 7; *Milwaukee School Report, 1870*, p. 5; Donnelly, "The Milwaukee Public Schools," pp. 442-446; and *Kansas City School Report, 1875*, p. 18. Educators and chroniclers of the rise of the Kansas City schools repeatedly equated district schools and non-graded classes with chaos and "disorganization." Flexibility and variety were popular not because of the innate stubbornness of the people but because of a realization that the establishment of a single system of education hindered their control of the formal educational process. Typical was the belief of James M. Greenwood that uniformity was the best educational aim, as quoted in Miller, *The History of Kansas City*, pp. 237-38.

[60] *Toledo Board of Education Minutes*, 25 Mar. 1870.

[61] *Rochester School Report, 1845*, p. 25. In the *Rochester School Report, 1871*, p. 118, the traunt officer blamed children's tardiness on "intemperate parents" whose offspring became "idle and dissolute and pests to the community." "Youth very seldom adopt vicious habits when they have plenty of schools," claimed the *Toledo Blade* on Nov. 9, 1854. In the *Kansas City School Report, 1887*, p. 27, Superintendent Greenwood agreed that "there is no more pitiable and trying position in which a teacher can be placed than that of rooting out vicious home training."

[62] Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform*, pp. 157-58. When a speaker at the N. E. A. meetings in the early 1800s attacked the standard position, he was lambasted by participants and by editors. Examine the rebuttal in "Education and Crime," *Journal of Education* 14 (August 11, 1881): 92-93.

[63] *Toledo Blade*, 5 Mar. 1853.

[64] *Toledo Blade*, 5 Sept. 1849.

[65] S. A. Ellis, "A Brief History of the Public Schools of the City of Rochester," *Publication of the Rochester Historical Society*

1 (1892): 82-83. When a Toledo school board member in the 1870s urged the end of Bible reading in the classroom, action was always deferred. See the Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 17 June 1874; and 30 June 1874.

[66] Kansas City School Report, 1881, p. 53.

[67] Kansas City Times, 21 Nov. 1879; and 19 Dec. 1884.

[68] Rochester School Report, 1843, p. 19. Viewing the schools as training centers for society's future leaders, the president of the Milwaukee school board emphasized the importance of morality, virtue, and intelligence in the life of the Republic; see the Milwaukee School Report, 1849, pp. 12-13. Superintendent Smyth of Toledo viewed schooling as a way to make the children's influences "auxiliary to virtue, and antagonistic to vice and irreligion." See the Toledo School Report, 1853, quoted in the Toledo Blade, 28 Mar. 1853.

[69] Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 20 Feb. 1850.

[70] Kansas City Journal of Commerce, 24 Dec. 1869.

[71] James M. Greenwood, Principles of Education Practically Applied (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1887), p. 192. Supporting documentation would be endless. Another useful sample, however, was provided in an article called "The Street School," in the Toledo Blade on December 10, 1852: "The street lessons are various. Idleness is the first and chief. Curiosity about evil is the next. Boldness and impudence are also taught. Then comes profame and filthy words, vile jests, unclean songs, quarreling, fighting, and even drinking. After a while the pupils in the street school are far enough advanced to go to the upper institutions, such as the jail and the almshouse."

[72] Rochester School Report, 1845, p. 19.

[73] Rochester School Report, 1859, p. 34.

[74] Ohio Journal of Education 2 (March 1853): 198. Smyth's background is sketched in James J. Burns, Educational History of Ohio (Columbus: Historical Publishing Company, 1905), pp. 441-42; and in Killits, Toledo and Lucas County, 1: 380.

[75] Milwaukee School Report, 1870, p. 7.

[76] Kansas City School Report, 1871, p. 8. On the Protestant nature of nineteenth-century education, see especially J. Merton

England, "The Democratic Faith in American Schoolbooks of the Republic, 1783-1861," *American Quarterly* 15 (Summer 1963): 191-99; David B. Tyack, "The Kingdom of God and the Common School: Protestant Ministers and the Educational Awakening in the West," *Harvard Educational Review* 36 (Fall 1966): 447-469; and Timothy Smith, "Protestant Schooling and American Nationality, 1800-1850," *Journal of American History* 53 (March 1967): 679-95. Ruth M. Elson's *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964) remains a standard reference.

[77] This was stated by John Eaton, Toledo's superintendent, as quoted in *A History of Education in the State of Ohio*, p. 184.

[78] Downes, *Lake Port*, pp. 287-88. James Burnes notes in *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System of the United States* (New York: Arno Press, 1969), p. 40, that Toledo's Catholics provided parochial institutions for their children as early as the 1840s.

[79] As early as March 18, 1853, the editor of the *Toledo Blade* typically argued that "if the Catholics or any other denomination are dissatisfied...they can establish their own schools, and no one will complain, but it is the very height of absurdity to argue that public money should be expended to indoctrinate children in the elements of sectarian faith." For an angry exchange between a local Catholic priest and the editor, see the *Toledo Blade*, 20 Apr. 1853.

[80] Frederick J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid* 3 vols. (Rochester: The Art Print Shop, 1925), 2: 133. Also consult McKelvey, *The Flower City*, pp. 151-52.

[81] J. B. L., "Rochester," *New England Journal of Education* 7 (April 4, 1878), p. 219; and Rev. Bishop McQuaid, "The Other Side of the Story," *Journal of Education* 17 (January 18, 1883): 35-36.

[82] A. D. Mayo, "Reply to Bishop McQuaid," *Journal of Education* 17 (March 29, 1883): 195-96; as well as Edwin D. Mead, "Bishop McQuaid's Impeachment of the Public Schools," *Journal of Education* 17 (February 15, 1883): 99-101.

[83] S. A. Ellis, "Bishop McQuaid and Our Public Schools," *Journal of Education* 17 (May 17, 1883): 307; and *Rochester School Report, 1883*, pp. 83-85, 97-98. Ellis explained that classroom calisthetics replaced recess since it was a better form of physical exercise, ignoring McQuaid's charges on vice and immorality.

[84] McQuaid believed that "Christian Free Schools" would make

children "virtuous and law-abiding citizens." See Zwierlein, Bishop McQuaid, 2: 119.

[85] Ninth Census, The Statistics of the Population of the United States vol. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872), Table 8. Ellis, "A Brief History," p. 82. In 1881 the Kansas City German Educational Society petitioned for the introduction of German but was refused by the school board, presumably for financial reasons. See the Kansas City Times, 4 Feb. 1881; and 18 Mar. 1881. Cf. the perspective in Brown and Dorsett, K. C., p. 46.

[86] Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 17 May 1852; 21 Sept. 1857; 15 July 1873; 6 Aug. 1876; 22 Aug. 1876; and 6 Oct. 1884; A History of Education in the State of Ohio, pp. 58-59. In Milwaukee, the history of foreign language training is briefly sketched in the Milwaukee School Report, 1873, pp. 78-82; Flower, Milwaukee, 1: 530-31; and Kathleen Neils Conzen, Immigrant Milwaukee 1836-1860 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 180.

[87] Milwaukee School Report, 1899, p. 94; Rochester School Report, 1875, pp. 15-16; and Donnelly, "The Milwaukee Public Schools," pp. 458-60. Robert C. Spencer, a prominent Milwaukee school board member, opposed the amount of time given to the teaching of German but agreed that Americanizing aims predominated in arguments favoring its establishment. See his article, "German in the Public Schools," Wisconsin Journal of Education 11 (May 1881): 210-211.

[88] Randolph C. Downes, History of Lake Shore Ohio 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1952), 2: 448.

[89] Ibid. Selwyn Troen describes similar motivations and social policies in The Public and the Schools (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1975), Chap. 3.

"Notes to Introduction to Part 2"

[1] Michael Katz, "Hardcore Educational History," *Reviews in American History* 8 (December 1980): 504-10.

[2] The vast literature on educational reform in the Progressive era will be cited in the appropriate, upcoming chapters.

[3] The literature on the origins of Progressivism is too extensive to cite here, but David P. Thelen's *The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973), remains a stimulating introduction to urban reform.

[4] Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 1.

"Notes to Chapter 2"

[1] Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (New York: The Modern Library, c. 1918).

[2] *The Industries of Rochester* (Rochester: The Elstner Publishing Company, 1888); *Bramble's Views: Toledo, Ohio; Diamond Anniversary, 1837-1912* (Toledo: Bramble Publishing Company, 1912); William J. Anderson, ed. *Milwaukee's Great Industries* (Milwaukee: Association for the Advancement of Milwaukee, 1892); *The Commerce of Kansas City in 1886* (Kansas City: S. Ferd. Howe, 1886); and *Kansas City: Its Resources and Development* (Kansas City Times, 1902).

[3] Quoted in Bayrd Still, *Milwaukee: The History of a City* (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), p. 324.

[4] *Ein Souvenir an die Milwaukee Industrie-Ausstellung, der Wisconsiner Staats-Ausstellung und des Nationalen Sangerfestes* (Milwaukee: Caspar & Zahn, Herausgeber, 1886), p. 61.

[5] *American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century*, vol. 16 (Elmsford, New York: Maxwell Reprint Company, c. 1970), pp. 998-99; and *Occupations at the Twelfth Census* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), pp. 453-55.

[6] Gerd Korman, *Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers: The View from Milwaukee, 1866-1921* (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967), Chap. 2; Still, *Milwaukee*, pp. 269-73; and *American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century*, pp. 998-99.

[7] *American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century*, pp. 1000-01.

[8] *Occupations at the Twelfth Census*, p. 466. Economic developments are analyzed in Blake McKelvey, *Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 46-53; idem, "A History of the Rochester Shoe Industry," *Rochester History* 15 (April 1953): 1-28; and William F. Peck, *History of Rochester and Monroe County, New York* (New York: The Pioneer Publishing Company, 1908), pp. 130-31. Peck estimated that there were "between sixty and seventy factories" for boots and shoes in 1908.

[9] Quoted in David Montgomery, *Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles*

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 69. Also see Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974); Melvyn Dubofsky, Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920 (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975); and James R. Green, The World of the Worker: Labor in Twentieth Century America (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980).

[10] The Industries of Rochester, p. 65.

[11] Blake McKelvey, "Organized Labor in Rochester Before 1914," Rochester History 25 (January 1963): 16-20; Edward W. Stevens, Jr., "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1917: An Historical Perspective on Social Control in Public Education," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971, p. 95; and James L. Brewer, "Centennial History of Organized Labor in Rochester," in Centennial History of Rochester, New York ed. Edward R. Foreman, 4 vols. (Rochester: John P. Smith Co., 1934), 4: 425-27, which highlights the city's open shop character.

[12] American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century, pp. 1002-03; Occupations at the Twelfth Census, pp. 473-75; Randolph C. Downes, Industrial Beginnings (Toledo: Published by the Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio, 1954), Chap. 5-9; and idem, History of Lake Shore, Ohio 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1952), 1: 228-99. On the natural gas boom and its political repercussions, see Russell S. McClure, "The Natural Gas Era in Northwestern Ohio," The Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio: Quarterly Bulletin 14 (July 1942): 83-105; and Chester Arthur Destler, American Radicalism, 1865-1901 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, c. 1946), Chap. 6.

[13] An invaluable source on the Hungarians is John M. Hrivnyak, "Birmingham: Toledo's Hungarian Community," M. A. thesis, University of Toledo, Chap. 4.

[14] Occupations at the Twelfth Census, pp. 448-50. On the significance of commerce and trade, see A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Drosett, K. C. A History of Kansas City Missouri (Boulder: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978), Chap. 2.

[15] American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century, pp. 996-97, 1000-01.

[16] Occupations at the Twelfth Census, p. 448.

[17] Brown and Dorsett, K. C., pp. 50-53; and Carrie Westlake Whitney, Kansas City, Missouri, Its History and People, 1808-

1908 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1908), 1: 481-93.

[18] *Kansas City: Its Resources and Their Development*, p. 86.

[19] All of these statistics are easily available in the 1880, 1890, and 1900 *Census* materials. The literature on the rise of the city is of course vast, though there are some important starting points: Richard C. Wade, *The Urban Frontier* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959); Constance McLaughlin Green, *The Rise of Urban America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); Charles N. Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967); Stephen Thernstrom and Richard Sennett eds., *Nineteenth-Century Cities* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969); and Howard P. Chudacoff, *The Evolution of American Urban Society* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975).

[20] Kathleen Neils Conzen, *Immigrant Milwaukee 1836-1860* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); Korman, *Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers*, Chap. 2; William George Bruce, *I Was Born in America* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1937), Chap. 3; idem, *History of Milwaukee City and County* 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1922), 1: 174-82; Still, *Milwaukee*, 259-67; and Theodore Mueller, "Milwaukee's German Heritage," *Historical Messenger* of the Milwaukee County Historical Society 22 (September 1966): 112-19.

[21] Still, *Milwaukee*, p. 259. On the city-building process and its relationship with specific immigrant groups, see Roger David Simon, "The Expansion of an Industrial City: Milwaukee, 1880-1910," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1971.

[22] *Report on the Social Statistics of Cities in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895), p. 112; and Bruce, *History of Milwaukee City and County* 1: 768-69.

[23] George LaPiana, *The Italians in Milwaukee, Wisconsin* (Milwaukee: Prepared under the Direction of the Associated Charities, 1915); Still, *Milwaukee*, pp. 276-77; and Alberto C. Meloni, "Italy Invades the Bloody Third--Milwaukee Italians, 1900-1910," *Historical Messenger* of the Milwaukee County Historical Soceity 25 (March 1969): 35-46.

[24] Still, *Milwaukee*, p. 268; Rev. Boleslaus E. Goral, "The Poles in Milwaukee," in *Memoirs of Milwaukee County* ed. Jerome A. Watrous, 2 vols. (Madison: Western Historical Association, 1909), 1: 612-33; and *Report on Population of the United States at the*

Eleventh Census: 1890 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895), p. 672.

[25] McKelvey, *The Quest for Quality*, p. 146; and *Report on Population of the United States at the Eleventh Census*, pp. 671-72. The Irish and Germans of Rochester are examined in two essays by Blake McKelvey, "The Irish in Rochester: An Historical Perspective," *Rochester History* 19 (October 1957): 1-16; and "The Germans of Rochester: Their Traditions and Contributions," *Rochester History* 20 (January 1958): 1-28.

[26] Stephen J. Bartha, "A History of Immigrant Groups in Toledo," M. A. thesis, Ohio State University, 1945, conveniently lists immigrant census figures for Toledo for the period 1870 to 1940 in its appendix. On the two Polish settlements, see Marvin Jay Glockner, "Assimilation of the Immigrant in the United States As Characterized by the Poles in Toledo," M. A. thesis, University of Toledo, 1966, p. 56. On the Hungarians, see Hrivnyak, "Birmingham: Toledo's Hungarian Community," Chap. 3.

[27] *Report on Population of the United States Census at the Eleventh Census*, pp. 670-73. The black population of Kansas City grew from 3,400 in 1870 to 17,500 in 1900 (out of a total population of 163,000). See especially Brown and Dorsett, *K. C.*, pp. 96-97; and Asa E. Martin, *Our Negro Population: A Sociological Study of the Negroes of Kansas City, Missouri* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1913).

[28] *Kansas City Mail*, 27 Aug. 1894. The best volume on attitudes toward immigration in the Progressive Era is still by John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New York: Atheneum, 1963). Also valuable is Barbara Miller Soloman, *Ancestors and Immigrants* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

[29] *Kansas City Mail*, 24 Sept. 1895. The Italians of Utica, Rochester, and Kansas City are studied in John W. Briggs, *An Italian Passage* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).

[30] *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, 15 Jan. 1898; and *Kansas City Star* 6 May 1894; and 20 February 1895. In the May article, the *Star* attacked the new "swarm" of immigrants as barbaric, law breaking, and cliquish; in the February editorial it chastized particular members of the local Protestant clergy for being overly sympathetic to the new immigrant poor.

[31] *Industrial Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: The Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, 1903), p. 1. The famous quotation was from Charles Dickens, *Hard Times* (New York: The New American Library, c. 1961), p. 11, and was intended as a critique of

utilitarianism and educational development in England.

[32] The literature on the 1890s is vast. Some of the best intellectual histories include Henry Steele Commager, The American Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950): Larzer Ziff, The American 1890s (New York: The Viking Press, 1966); and the older volume by Thomas Beer, The Mauve Decade (New York: Vintage Books, c. 1926). Mrs. Henry G. Danforth of Rochester claimed that "the decade of the Nineties was a good ten years in spite of the depression of '93 and the brief heroics of the war with Spain. No one thought of expecting aid from the national government during the first, nor that the civilian population had duties for the second." In "Rochester's Gay Nineties," Rochester Historical Society Publications 20 (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1942): 41-49.

33. Lawrence Goodwyn, Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); and David Thelen, The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973); and Sally M. Miller, "Milwaukee: Of Ethnicity and Labor," Socialism and the Cities ed. Bruce M. Stave (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1975), p. 45.

[34] Thelen, The New Citizenship, Chap. 4; Douglas W. Steeples, "The Panic of 1893: Contemporary Reflections and Reactions," Mid-America 47 (July 1965): 155-75; and Melvin Holli, "Urban Reform in the Progressive Era," in The Progressive Era ed. Lewis Gould (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974), who has written: "The shock of that event reverberated throughout the land, but it shook the cities with a special ferocity." (p. 133).

[35] Kansas City Mail, 26 Aug. 1893. The Toledo Evening Bee, 27 Mar. 1894, similarly editorialized: "The panic had its effect upon nearly all classes of society. It produced a fright that permeated everywhere, and from it sprung up a crop of calamity howlers that only increased its intensity."

[36] William J. Reese, "Between Home and School: Organized Parents, Clubwomen, and Urban Education in the Progressive Era," School Review 87 (November 1978): 3-28; and Allen Davis, Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), Chap. 3.

[37] The Kansas City Star, for example, continued to editorialize that things were better in Missouri than elsewhere, which was little consolation to the thousands of unemployed. It went so far as to call these years "An Era of Good Cheer." See the paper for 3 Jan. 1894; 3 Mar. 1894; 8 May 1894; and 11 June 1894. Also see the Toledo Evening Bee, 8 July 1895, for the recurring theme that prosperity was right around the corner.

[38] Charles S. Smith et. al., "The Business Outlook," North American Review 157 (October 1893): 389.

[39] Albert C. Stevens, "Phenomenal Aspects of the Financial Crisis," The Forum 16 (September 1893): 23. Other useful contemporary studies were published by Edward Atkinson, "The Benefits of Hard Times," The Forum 20 (Summer 1895): 79-90; Alexander D. Noyes, "The Banks and the Panic of 1893," Political Science Quarterly 9 (March 1894): 12-30; and William E. Russell, "Political Causes of the Business Depression," North American Review 157 (December 1893): 641-52. Also see Samuel Rezneck, "Unemployed, Unrest, and Relief in the United States during the Depression of 1893-1897," The Journal of Political Economy 61 (August 1953): 324-45.

[40] Toledo Blade, 21 Oct. 1892.

[41] Kansas City Star, 12 Jan. 1892. Though it is highly uncritical of its subject, a useful description of the rise of the local press is William L. McCorkle, "Nelson's Star and Kansas City, 1880-1898," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas-Austin, 1968.

[42] Kansas City Mail, 12 Oct. 1892.

[43] The Star's position is easily traced through its editorials and news reports for 20 May 1893; 6 June 1893; 10 June 1893; 13 June 1893; 20 June 1893; and 1 July 1893.

[44] Kansas City Star, 15 July 1893. Details on local bank failures are from the Kansas City Mail, 14 July 1893 and 17 July 1893. The Star reluctantly admitted on August 4 that in all probability savings deposits at several of the banks would never be recovered.

[45] Toledo Evening Bee, 27 Sept. 1893. The question was how long the workers would continue to support the social system, claimed the worried editor.

[46] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 28 Oct. 1893. Already "500 tailors' hands" were out of work for several weeks, and shoemakers suffered equally disastrous setbacks.

[47] Steeples, "The Panic of 1893," pp. 155-73. David Thelen describes the changing views of urban Wisconsin in The New Citizenship, Part 2.

[48] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 11 Dec. 1893. Gannett was surprised at the restraint of the poor in the face of the opulence of others. He praised the poor for their willingness to share with each other in times of crisis.

[49] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 Feb. 1894; Albert C. Stevens, "Analysis of the Phenomenon of the Panic in the United States in 1893," Quarterly Journal of Economics 8 (January 1894): 257; McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, Chap. 3; and Patricia E. Fisler, "The Depression of 1893 in Rochester," Rochester History 15 (June 1952): 1-24.

[50] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 7 Aug. 1894. The local judge then sentenced eight "tramps" to six months in the penitentiary for allegedly assaulting a woman, even though the woman in question was not required to testify in court. It was called the "War on the Tramps."

[51] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 3 Nov. 1893. It must be remembered that the Society was complaining at a time when the depression had not yet arrived in full force. Organized charity, however, completely failed to handle the distress during these years. By early 1894, the Charity Organization Society told of tales of freezing children and reluctantly admitted that it could not handle the social problems. See the Democrat and Chronicle, 24 Feb. 1894. The failure of private charity to fully cope with distress was evidenced by charity networks in Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City.

[52] McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, p. 63. The Mission had been established in 1889. See Rev. Orlo J. Price, "One Hundred Years of Protestanism in Rochester," in Centennial History of Rochester 3: 320.

[53] Toledo Evening Bee, 17 Nov. 1893.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Thelen, The New Citizenship, pp. 58-59.

[56] Emil Seidel, Sketches from My Life, umpublished autobiography, 2 vols. (1938), 2: 14. (Emil Seidel Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.)

[57] Kansas City Mail, 11 Aug. 1893.

[58] Kansas City Star, 18 Aug. 1893.

[59] Kansas City Star, 2 Nov. 1893 and 6 June 1894. The Provident Association promised to run its charity on "business principles" and scrupulously investigated the economic and personal lifestyles of potential recipients. See the Star for 15 Dec. 1891 and 15 Dec. 1893 as well as the above dates.

[60] Kansas City Mail, 8 Dec. 1893.

[61] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 11 Nov. 1893.

[62] Kansas City Star, 2 Aug. 1893. An attorney who lived in Kansas City in the 1890s recalled the experience during the so-called Great Depression of the 1930s. He said that "the majority appeared to have lost everything by the reaction from the preceding boom; far more people proportionately than today were at their wits end to scratch out an existence." See Elmer N. Powell, "Kansas City in the 1890s," (1932), p. 1 (Elmer N. Powell Papers, Western Manuscripts Collection, University of Missouri, Folder 2102).

[63] Kansas City Star, 5 July 1894. The extensiveness of the depression is the subject of Brown and Dorsett, who note in their book, K. C., that unemployment was already high in the city when the depression struck. (p. 88) Also see Patricia Youmans Wagner, "Voluntary Associations in Kansas City, Missouri 1870-1900," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas City, 1962, pp. 23, 76-78.

[64] Kansas City Labor, 7 Dec. 1895.

[65] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 14 Aug. 1897.

[66] Kansas City Mail, 9 Apr. 1895.

"Notes to Chapter 3"

[1] Lizzie B. Kander, "The Evolution of the Husband," a paper presented to the Wednesday Afternoon Club (November 28, 1902). (Lizzie Black Kander Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.)

[2] Sheila Rothman, Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1978), p. 4; more generally, Morton Keller writes the following in Affairs of State: Public Life in Late Nineteenth Century America (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 517: "Voluntary associations, always significant American institutions, took on increasing importance in the late nineteenth century." The women's club movement is discussed in Gerda Lerner, The Woman in American History (Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1971); Lois W. Banner, Women in Modern America: A Brief History (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974); and Mary P. Ryan, Womanhood in America: From Colonial Times to the Present (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975). For a discussion of antebellum voluntary associations for women, consult Barbara J. Berg, The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism: The Woman and the City, 1800-1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), Chap. 7.

[3] Samuel T. Dutton and David Snedden, The Administration of Public Education in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), p. 592.

[4] My initial investigation on the role of women in Progressive school reform was "Between Home and School: Organized Parents, Clubwomen, and Urban Education in the Progressive Era," School Review 87 (November 1978): 3-28. For the standard study of Progressive intellectuals, see Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Random House, 1961). The literature on the feminization of teaching is immense, but at least see the following: Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 56-57, 193; David B. Tyack, The One Best System (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 59-64; and Redding S. Sugg, Mother-teacher: The Feminization of American Education (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978). On the importance of women in urban Progressivism, see David P. Thelen, The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1972), Chap. 5; Mary Ritter Beard, Woman's Work in Municipalities (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1915); and Jill Conway, "Women Reformers and American Culture, 1870-1930," Journal of Social History 5 (Winter 1971-72): 164-82.

[5] The best studies on the new middle class in the Progressive

Era are by Robert Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967); and by Tyack, The One Best System.

[6] Milwaukee School Report, 1878, p. 78.

[7] Milwaukee Sentinel, 13 Dec. 1891; and Toledo Blade, 14 Nov. 1890. The Blade editorialized that women had too much common sense to be attracted to contemporary women's clubs.

[8] Kansas City Star, 19 Feb. 1891.

[9] Toledo Blade, 13 Jan. 1894. Also see the Toledo Evening Bee for 9 Jan. 1898, where it was argued that "never in the history of Toledo have women taken such interest in civic affairs as at present." The Blade (27 July 1899) estimated that 54 clubs existed in the city by the end of the decade.

[10] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 6 Feb. 1898 and 2 Feb. 1899.

[11] Kansas City Mail, 7 Dec. 1892.

[12] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 11 Apr. 1893 and 8 Dec. 1893. Also examine Mrs. Harriet Dow, "The Influence of Women in the Life of Rochester," in Centennial History of Rochester, New York ed. Edward R. Foreman, 4 vols. (Rochester: Printed by John P. Smith Company, Inc., 1933), 2: 189-207; Jeannette W. Huntington, Women's Educational and Industrial Union (Rochester: Written for the Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration, 1943), pp. 1-11; "Minutes of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union," 1893-1896 volume, pp. 83-89 (Women's Educational and Industrial Union (W.E.I.U.) Papers, Rochester Public Library, Rochester, New York); and Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1920 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 11-12.

[13] Toledo Blade, 13 Feb. 1909.

[14] Thelen, The New Citizenship, pp. 69, 93-94, 119; Jerome A. Watrous, ed. 2 vols. Memoirs of Milwaukee County (Madison: Western Historical Association, 1909), 1: 403-04; and Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Clubs (Berlin, Wi: Printed by George C. Hicks, 1897), pp. 28-35.

[15] Kansas City Star, 23 May 1894; and 26 May 1894; Child-Welfare Magazine 13 (August 1919): 330; Carrie Westlake Whitney, 3 vols. Kansas City, Missouri, Its History and People, 1808-1908 (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1908), 1: 627-30;

and *Kansas City and Its Schools* (Kansas City: Prepared for the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, 1917), pp. 89-90.

[16] See, for example, *Constitution, By-Laws, and Standing Rules of the Woman's School Alliance of Wisconsin* (Milwaukee, 1897), pp. 8-10, for a primary source. The widespread activities of the women's clubs are well documented in the fine study by Karen J. Blair, "The Clubwoman as Feminist: The Woman's Culture Club Movement in the United States, 1868-1914," Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York-Buffalo, 1976. A useful study of Ohio club women is by Annie Laws, *History of the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs* (Cincinnati: The Ebbert & Richardson Co., 1924).

[17] Whitney, *Kansas City Missouri*, 1: 629; and Reese, "Between Home and School," pp. 8-9.

[18] Lizzie Black Kander, "Graduating Essay," 1878. (Kander Papers). A valuable study of Kander's life is by Ann Shirley Waligorski, "Social Action and Women: The Experience of Lizzie Black Kander," M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1970.

[19] Kander pointed out that the reputations of assimilated Jews were at stake as thousands of impoverished immigrants came to America. She was not surprised that at first many recent arrivals were suspicious of the motives of settlement workers. "They cannot conceive how anyone can devote time and money to a cause, without some expectation of gain," Kander wrote in 1900, and she added that personal gain was obviously one product of philanthropic effort. See the "President's Annual Report," Milwaukee Jewish Mission, 1900 (Kander Papers).

[20] Part of Kander's early life is set to song in "My Sewing Society," and in an undated address before the Milwaukee Girls' Trade School, pp. 1-6 (Kander Papers). Also consult Waligorski, "Social Action and Women," especially Chap. 4, for her community activities.

[21] See the newspaper clippings in the Kander Papers.

[22] "The President's Annual Report," Milwaukee Jewish Mission, 1900 (Kander Papers).

[23] See especially Kander's essay, "Is the Saloon an Evil, & If So What is the Remedy?" n.d. (Kander Papers).

[24] "Diary of a Trip Down South," 1895 (Kander Papers).

[25] McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, pp. 11-12; and Peck, History of Rochester, pp. 232-33.

[26] Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Flower City, 1855-1890 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 158. The literature on Susan B. Anthony is naturally extensive. Several older volumes are still valuable: Ida H. Harper, The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony, 3 vols. (Indianapolis: The Hollenbeck Press, 1908); and Rheta Childe Door, Susan B. Anthony (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1928).

[27] Toledo Blade, 26 Apr. 1894; and 18 May 1894. A short biography of Segur is provided in the Toledo Evening Bee, 25 Feb. 1895.

[28] The literature is cited in Reese, "Between Home and School," p. 5. In particular see Lerner, The Women in American History, p. 118; and Rothman, Woman's Proper Place, pp. 14-18.

[29] The Herald, a conservative organ of the Republican machine, had red-baited Montgomery in January, 1897. Philip Jackson, a leading Socialist, promptly corrected the editor and defended Montgomery in a letter to the editor. Both sources are in the W.E.I.U. "Scrapbook, 1896-1901," pp. 137-38 (W.E.I.U. Papers). Montgomery's activities can be traced in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 8 Dec. 1893; 9 Apr. 1896; 4 Feb. 1897; and through her addresses in the annual reports of the W.E.I.U. in the organization's manuscript collection.

[30] Yearbook of the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, 1896-97 (Rochester: 1897), pp. 13-14 (W.E.I.U. Papers); and Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 9 Apr. 1896. Her lecture in the Democrat and Chronicle was appropriately entitled "The New Woman."

[31] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 18 Jan. 1895.

[32] Toledo Evening Bee, 11 Nov. 1898. The address was before the City Federation of Women's Clubs on the subject of school extension.

[33] Kansas City Mail, 7 Dec. 1892.

[34] Toledo Blade, 4 Feb. 1897. The Blade later asserted (27 July 1899) that "the club idea is making great headway among women. What is doing in Toledo is but an index of the progress along this line all over Ohio--and in fact all over the West."

[35] Tenth Biennial Convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs (Newark, New Jersey: General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1910), p. 65, notes that "Woman is the mother of the race: she is the conserver and preserver of the world. Organized womanhood is a civic force of unlimited power." Richard Jenson, in a study of the backgrounds of several thousand female leaders of the Progressive Era, has discovered that no variable explains civic participation in certain types of reform activities more strongly than "Motherhood." Mothers in clubs and other organizations demonstrated a greater interest in humanitarian reforms than childless wives in these clubs. See "Family, Career, and Reform: Women Leaders of the Progressive Era," in The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective ed. Michael Gordon (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973), pp. 276-78. The grass-roots nature of the club movement is described in William L. O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1969), p. 85.

[36] Toledo Blade, 4 Feb. 1897. Also see The Work and Words of the National Congress of Mothers (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1897). On the rise of parent teacher associations see Steven L. Schlossman, "Before Home Start: Notes Toward a History of Parent Education in America: 1897-1929," Harvard Educational Review 46 (1976): 436-67; Julian Butterwork, The Parent-Teacher Association and Its Work (New York: Macmillan Company, 1928); and the various sources listed in Reese, "Between Home and School," pp. 23-28.

[37] The West Side Mothers' Club, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1912-13 (Milwaukee, 1913), p. 1. (The West Side Mothers' Club Papers, Milwaukee County Historical Society, Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

[38] Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Clubs (1910), p. 7. Rheta Childe Dorr, in a widely read account of organized women and social reform in the Progressive Era, also asserted that "Women's place is Home. Her task is homemaking. But Home is not contained within the four walls of an individual home. Home is the community. The city full of people is the Family. The public school is the real Nursery. And badly do the Home and the Family and the Nursery need their mother." See What Eight Million Women Want (Boston: Small, Maynard, & Co., 1910), p. 327. Also see Peter G. Filene, Him Her Self: Sex Roles in Modern America (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975), p. 15.

[39] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 14 Feb. 1896.

[40] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 8 Mar. 1895. This club was the leading suffrage organization in the city.

[41] Toledo Blade, 24 Oct. 1894.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Toledo Blade, 30 Nov. 1895. Miss Emily Bouton continued: "Dangers there always are in the process of taking a step forward involving so much that is vital to the home, and thus to the child's welfare. And...there was never a time when woman's responsibility was greater than it is today...The increased responsibility does not rest alone upon the few who have gained the higher education, or upon the many who, from choice or necessity stand outside of that home life in which woman is the center, but upon each and all alike."

[44] Milwaukee Sentinel, 1 Oct. 1898.

[45] Dorr, Eight Million Women, p. 57; and Beard, Women's Work, Chap. 1, where the author noted that women's interest in schooling was due "partly because of their intimate family relation through little children and partly because of the fact that women teachers formed an easy bond for cooperation. Today there exists an incredible number of organizations whose main purpose is cooperation with the schools in one way or another." (pp. 38-39). The bonds were not that easy to form, but Beard's assertions were very insightful.

[46] Toledo Blade, 24 Oct. 1894.

[47] Constitution, By-Laws, and Standing Rules of the Woman's School Alliance of Wisconsin, 1897, p. 2. When the Alliance formed, "the ladies felt that there were many things in school life which are apparent to mothers that are unnoticed by fathers," as quoted by Mrs. Harriet Holton Robertson, "Women's School Alliance of Wisconsin," in Milwaukee's Great Industries, ed. W. J. Anderson and Julius Bleyer (Milwaukee: Association for the Advancement of Milwaukee, 1892), p. 36.

[48] Toledo Blade, 27 Feb. 1892.

[49] Toledo Blade, 24 Oct. 1894.

[50] Though superintendent's reports have been extensively used by historians who have emphasized the importance of the new middle class, school proceedings, newspapers, and the original records of local women's groups demonstrate the importance of voluntary associations in school reform in the entire Progressive Era. All of these materials must be used to present a full view of the reform process, since various interest groups were engaged in regular interaction with each other and with school officials.

[51] While teachers have been depicted in a very critical fashion in contemporary literature on schooling, particularly on urban education, a more sympathetic appraisal is available in Tyack, The One Best System, pp. 97-104. A useful examination of the powerlessness of the teacher in one city is by Mark Van Pelt, "The Teacher and the Urban Community: Milwaukee, 1860-1900," (M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1978), which tried to reconstruct the process of nepotism and the insecurity it caused in the lives of individual teachers.

[52] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 23 Sept. 1898; and Yearbook of the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, 1896-97 (Rochester, 1897), p. 3 (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[53] Law's background has been pieced together from articles in the Toledo Blade, 17 Mar. 1894 and 11 Oct. 1898; and in the Toledo Evening Bee, 14 Feb. 1895 and 27 Nov. 1898; and Harvey Scribner, ed. 2 vols. Memoirs of Lucas County and the City of Toledo (Madison: Western Historical Association, 1910), 1: 286.

[54] Constitution, By-Laws, and Standing Rules of the Woman's School Alliance, 1897, p. 2; Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Clubs, pp. 28-29.

[55] The names were drawn from the above Alliance document, pp. 11-15.

[56] Flanders was an energetic woman. She was involved in settlement work with Lizzie Kander and had considerable success with mothers' meetings and parent-teacher associations. On the popularity of the mothers' meetings, see the Milwaukee Sentinel, 22 Jan. 1897; on the settlement work, see Lizzie Black Kander, "President's Report," The Settlement, 1905 (Kander Papers).

[57] Jones' Island is described in Bayrd Still's Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), p. 363; and by William George Bruce, A Short History of Milwaukee (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1936), p. 139.

[58] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 22 Feb. 1896.

[59] In 1896, Helen Montgomery argued that parents and others had often criticized the teachers but never visited the schools enough. See Huntington, Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, p. 3. Montgomery later argued that "we aim to bring the mother in closer touch with the schools, to encourage more frequent visiting on her part, deeper interest, more intelligent

cooperation with the teacher, to bring to bear on the child the strongest possible influence for good," in Yearbook of the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, 1896-97, p. 12.

[60] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 4 Apr. 1890. This organization had been formed a year earlier and had a fitful existence in the early 1890s. Many professors from the University of Rochester were active in the group, which supported women for the school board and the application of good government reforms to the schools, namely, school board centralization and a greater attention to the professional development of the teaching staff. Also see the Democrat and Chronicle for 18 Mar. 1890; 3 Apr. 1891; and 8 Feb. 1894. McKelvey briefly discusses the association in The Quest for Quality, p. 34.

[61] Toledo Blade, 1 Feb. 1895.

[62] Reese, "Between Home and School," pp. 3-28; Thelen, The New Citizenship, Chap. 5; Beard, Women's Work, Chap. 1; and Door, Eight Million Women, Chap. 2.

[63] The best sources for the evolution of Progressive ideas on the local level are the grass-roots petitions and original writings of the women and parents themselves. Helen Montgomery, for example, delivered an address in 1896 on the "new education," a term which was later used interchangeably with "progressive education," just as the "new woman" was often referred to as a "progressive woman." See Montgomery's speech in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 30 Jan. 1896. In Toledo, as in the other cities in this study, club women in the Nineties attacked corporal punishment, cramming, overtesting, and other aspects of what they called the "old system of education." Many were familiar with Froebel's writings which emphasized motherhood themes since they were teachers themselves. See, for example, discussions of the old and new education by these women in the Toledo Blade, 1 Feb. 1895; and the series of editorials written by the Toledo Evening Bee in September, October, and November, 1898. The positions of women in these cities will be more apparent as the chapter proceeds to an examination of their actual demands before local school boards. After the 1880s, there is a large number of periodical articles in state and national educational journals on the new education. An important essay on the origins of reform is Timothy L. Smith, "Progressivism in American Education, 1880-1900," Harvard Educational Review 31 (1961): 168-93.

[64] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 Mar. 1898. This phenomenon is noted by Steven L. Schlossman, Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of 'Progressive' Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 76.

[65] Numerous letters to the editor appeared in the Kansas City Journal of Commerce from the last half of December, 1892, through the middle of January, 1893.

[66] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 21 Dec. 1892.

[67] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 25 Dec. 1892. These sorts of criticisms were made famous by Joseph Mayer Rice in his famous articles in *The Forum* in 1892 and 1893, and gathered in *The Public School System of the United States* (New York: Arno Press, c. 1969).

[68] James M. Greenwood to Josephine Heermans, Aug. 10, 1904. (James M. Greenwood Papers, Kansas City Public Library, Kansas City, Missouri). Here Greenwood wrote: "John Dewey, like the most of those Chicago folks, is striving after something he hardly knows what. Should he decide to turn his attention to Greek mythology for the purpose of ascertaining what the hierarchy of Gods thought of Jupiter's thoughts, he possibly might dig up something not heretofore known." Since Greenwood was at one time the President of the N.E.A. and a prolific contributor of essays to educational journals on the state and national level, he was well known across the country. There are many short studies of his long career, but the most accessible analysis for most readers is Wilfred R. Hollister and Harry Norman, *Five Famous Missourians* (Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Company, 1908), pp. 265-333; and the eulogy entitled "Dr. J. M. Greenwood," *Missouri School Journal* 31 (September 1914): 401-06.

[69] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 25 Dec. 1892.

[70] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 26 Dec. 1892. The principal of the Karnes School also wrote a series of rebuttals against the "unfair critics" of the school system.

[71] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 28 Dec. 1892.

[72] *Kansas City Journal of Commerce*, 31 Dec. 1892, where the writer asserted, "As a class, teachers are kindly conscientious--a true teacher always so. But pressure from above changes maternal promptings toward helpless children into self-preservative methods against the martinet marker into whose hands is committed her financial fate, as shown to the school board on an ascending scale from 0 to 10 plus."

[73] *Kansas City Journal*, 3 Jan. 1893. The teacher claimed that pedagogues stood in constant fear for their positions. "Military order is quite as objectionable to many teachers as to parents. But if it is not maintained, the assistant superintendent will have a *billet doux* on your desk to the effect that 'dignity of position' is essential to effective work." "If a teacher, more daring than her colleagues, ever asserts her rights or individuality, she is speedily transferred to a school on the outskirts or beyond the city limits, where she can cool down and repent at leisure."

[74] Dorothy Galloway, "James Mickleborough Greenwood: An Evaluation of His Services as an Educator and His Contributions to Educational Thought," M.A. thesis, Washington University, 1931, pp. 16-17. Galloway erred in dating this event but otherwise accurately assessed the social effects of this plan on school board membership. More will be said of this in later chapters.

[75] Kansas City Mail, 7 Dec. 1892; 19 Dec. 1892; 4 Jan. 1893; 10 Jan. 1893; 20 Jan. 1893; 9 Oct. 1893; and 21 Feb. 1894. In the initial editorial cited, the Mail stated: "Kansas City people indulge in a pleasant little fiction that their own public schools are the best in the country, and embrace in their curriculum all the broad and progressive ideas which can be picked up anywhere...Some of the mothers of the city, however, who are not upon the school board, are rapidly waking up."

[76] Kansas City Star, 30 Dec. 1892.

[77] This is based on a close reading of Milwaukee's newspapers and the petitions of the Alliance presented to the school board. See especially the following dates in the Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board: 2 June 1891; 6 Oct. 1891; 1 Dec. 1891; 3 July 1893; 5 Feb. 1895; 3 Mar. 1896; 7 Apr. 1896; and 11 Apr. 1899.

[78] Milwaukee Sentinel, 8 Apr. 1891.

[79] Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 11 Apr. 1899.

[80] The president's quote is from the Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 5 May 1896; the committee's rejoinder is from idem, 7 May 1896.

[81] A typical list of Alliance demands is found in the Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 5 Feb. 1895.

[82] On the appointment of the woman, see the Milwaukee Daily News, 4 Mar. 1896; Milwaukee Sentinel, 4 Mar. 1896; Still, Milwaukee, p. 416; and Watrous, Memoirs of Milwaukee County, 1: 405, who argued that the female school board member's appointment to the visiting committee "was regarded in the nature of a joke, as the visiting committee was more theoretical than practical. But Mrs. Merrill [the Alliance representative] infused new life into it and made it of some utility. Cellars and garrets of school buildings were visited by her direction, sanitary conditions were improved, and reforms in ventilation, heating, etc., were instituted."

[83] Milwaukee Sentinel, 14 Mar. 1895. In Toledo a German on the school board simply said, "we don't vant no vomen aroundt," accord-

ing to the Toledo Blade, 2 Mar. 1892.

[84] Milwaukee Sentinel, 14 Mar. 1895.

[85] The Milwaukee Sentinel, 3 May 1895, provides some commentary on the stand of the German newspaper. Of the thirteen members of Council who voted against the appointment of a woman, nine were German.

[86] The controversy between the women and the school board is easily traced in the Toledo Blade on 16 Feb. 1892; 1 Mar. 1892; and 2 Mar. 1892. On the anti-Catholic feelings of the American Protective Association regarding Law's candidacy, see idem, 16 Mar. 1895.

[87] Toledo Blade, 18 May 1894.

[88] On ballot irregularities and political intimidation tactics, see the Toledo Evening Bee, 16 Mar. 1895; and the Toledo Blade, 20 Mar. 1895.

[89] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 17 Aug. 1897. The Commissioner also said "The school is no place to teach sewing; if the ladies desire to reach the children, let them go from house to house, and teach the mothers, and then let the mothers impart instruction to their children."

[90] Rochester School Report, 1890, p. 54. He continued his attacks on "faddism" in the Rochester School Report, 1891, p. 54; Rochester School Report, 1895, p. 21; and Rochester Annual Report, 1897, p. 5, where he favored "fundamentals" over "showy experiments."

[91] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 11 Nov. 1894.

[92] Yearbook of the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, 1896-97, p. 13.

[93] W.E.I.U. "Scrapbook, 1893-1896," pp. 152-53. (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[94] Rochester School Report, 1897, pp. 93-95.

[95] Ibid., p. 94.

[96] Quoted in Schlossman, Love and the American Delinquent, p. 76.

[97] Richard Ely, The Coming City (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1902), p. 63.

"Notes to Chapter 4"

[1] The role of the "new middle class" has been brillantly surveyed in Robert Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967); and in David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[2] Toledo Blade, 15 Nov. 1895.

[3] Israel Kugler, "The Trade Union Career of Susan B. Anthony," Labor History 2 (Winter 1961): 90-100; Bayrd Still, Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), p. 284; and Toledo Blade, 16 Feb. 1892.

[4] This point was earlier made in William J. Reese, "'Partisans of the Proletariat': The Socialist Working Class and the Milwaukee Schools, 1890-1920," History of Education Quarterly (forthcoming). Jones' influence on women's ideas will be clarified in later chapters.

[5] American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century (Elmsford, New York: Maxwell Reprint Company, c. 1970), pp. 996-1003.

[6] Alan Dawley, Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 143.

[7] By reading through the proceedings and minute books of the boards of education of these several cities for the Progressive era and corresponding newspaper reports of these meetings, one can easily reconstruct which laboring groups had direct impact on school innovation. To say that this "labor aristocracy" was more visible, of course, is not to say that other laboring groups were unimportant elements of urban life. Later chapters will show how the Milwaukee Socialist movement in particular tried to expand beyond its German and skilled base.

[8] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 18 Nov. 1896.

[9] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 2 Sept. 1890 and 22 Apr. 1894.

[10] Evening Bee, 1 Aug. 1899.

[11] Kansas City Star, 4 Sept. 1893 and 5 Sept. 1893. Under new ownership, the Kansas City Mail blamed workers for the depression and the radical tendencies of the times. On March 2, 1897, it

argued: "The truth is that the attitude of labor toward capital and employers of labor is the great trouble with the business of the country today...Union labor is a constant menace to business life." Also see the Mail for 16 Apr. 1894; 26 May 1894; 12 June 1894; 28 June 1894; and 12 July 1894.

[12] On labor organizations in these cities see Blake McKelvey, "Organized Labor in Rochester before 1914," Rochester History 25 (January 1963): 1-24; Edward Stevens, Jr., "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1897: An Historical Perspective on Social Control in Public Education," Ed.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971, Chap. 4; G. Maude Brown, "A History of Organized Labor in Toledo," M.A. thesis, University of Toledo, 1924; Thomas W. Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement in Milwaukee (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965); and A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Dorsett, K. C.: A History of Kansas City, Missouri (Boulder: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 91-93.

[13] Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Flower City, 1855-1890 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 75-77; and idem, "Organized Labor," pp. 6-7.

[14] Toledo Blade, 15 May 1863; and Toledo Commercial, 27 July 1870. Even Toledo's historian, Randolph Downes, in History of Lake Shore Ohio 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1952), 1: 578, argued that in the depression of the 1870s organized and unorganized labor "struck blindly" against lower pay. "They caused much loss of life and property." Unlike McKelvey's volumes on Rochester, which are superior examples of the craft of local history, Downes' volumes are unsympathetic to the history of working-class struggle.

[15] Brown, "Organized Labor in Toledo," Chap. 4.

[16] Kansas City Mail, 24 July 1893. Religious metaphors, as will be shown throughout this essay, were common in working-class literature of protest.

[17] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 8 Feb. 1892.

[18] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 18 Nov. 1896.

[19] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 29 Sept. 1896. This statement was made by a New York Socialist who emphasized that at least 5 million workers were already unemployed in the nation. On Rochester's economic situation, see Albert C. Stevens, "Analysis of the Phenomenon of the Panic in the United States in 1893," Quarterly Journal of Economics 8 (January 1894): 257.

[20] Constitution, By-Laws, and Rules of Order of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Rochester and Vicinity (Rochester: The Labor Journal, 1904), p. 3. These themes were common in radical and non-radical workingclass literature.

[21] Randolph C. Downes, Industrial Beginings (Toledo: The Toledo Printing Company, 1954), pp. 125-26; and Toledo Blade, 10 Mar. 1893.

[22] The People's Call, 8 Sept. 1894.

[23] Attacks against Debs and Altgeld in particular were long and severe. See the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 10 Jan. 1895, which applauded Debs' imprisonment; the Evening Bee, 6, 12, and 16 July 1894, which did likewise; and the Kansas City Star, which ran a string of editorials against Debs during and after the Pullman Strike.

[24] Kansas City Mail, 15 Nov. 1892.

[25] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 29 Sept. 1896.

[26] The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, for example, urged workers to use the ballot box and ignore the "class struggle." "In this country the ballot is irresistible. Why should men who control that tremendous force waste their time and strength in strikes and boycotts and such-like futilities?" (10 July 1894). Though additional sources can easily be marshalled, the Kansas City Star best summed up the usual position when it asserted on January 12, 1892 that "the American workingman, native and naturalized...is the best paid, the best read, the best fed and clothed and schooled and nurtured, the most independent and the most ambitious man of his class in the world." Even as the depression created economic chaos in Kansas City, the Star made an identical point in an editorial on September 3, 1894.

[27] Rochester Labor, 6 June 1896; and Kansas City Labor, 7 Dec. 1895.

[28] Midland Mechanic, 28 Apr. 1898.

[29] Midland Mechanic, 14 July 1898.

[30] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 23 Sept. 1897.

[31] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 2 Jan. 1899. Lippelt engaged in a long harangue against plutocratic control of the

press, the church, and the economy.

[32] *The People's Call*, 25 Aug. 1894.

[33] Gavett, *Development of the Labor Movement*, p. 3.

[34] R. Ogden, "The Great Goddess Prosperity," *Nation* 69 (December 14, 1899), p. 442.

[35] In cities like Chicago, for example, the police force violently attacked peaceful Socialist marchers in labor parades; the *Kansas City Star* endorsed this police action on 12 Nov. 1891 and 18 Nov. 1891.

[36] *Konstitution and Neben-Gesetze der Brauerei-Engineer und Fuerleute Lokal-Union* (Milwaukee, 1913), p. 3. Marx's famous words were commonly placed on banners and publications of the Federated Trade Council in the 1890s.

[37] Lawrence Goodwyn, *Democratic Promise: The Populist Movement in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); David P. Thelen, *The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1972); and Herbert F. Margulies, *The Decline of the Progressive Movement in Wisconsin 1890-1920* (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1968), p. 12. Because few original records of the urban Populists survive, I have relied on newspaper reports of their meetings in the regular press and accessible Populist newspapers for the period.

[38] *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, 14 Sept. 1894.

[39] *Toledo Blade*, 4 Feb. 1893. That the Populists succeeded was doubtful.

[40] *Kansas City Star*, 2 May 1892. The opposition *Mail* asserted on October 11, 1893, that "Mormons and Socialists should be scattered to the four winds."

[41] *Kansas City Star*, 19 July 1894 and 23 Sept. 1894; and *Kansas City Mail*, 22 Feb. 1894. Also see Brown and Dorsett, *K. C.*, pp. 90-91, 110.

[42] Williams Jennings Bryan, of course, was nominated as a fusion candidate for President by the Democrats in 1896, but he was not a true Populist.

[43] On the history of the Federated Trades Council, see espec-

ially its own writings, The Federated Trades Council Directory of Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Milwaukee: Published by the Trade and Labor Association, 1892); Artisan Day Souvenir (Milwaukee: Meyer-Rotier Printing Co. 1894); End of the Century Labor Day Souvenir (Milwaukee: Germania Press, 1900), as well as its manuscript collection and minutes deposited at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin (which will be later cited throughout this study). Excellent secondary treatments include Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement; Still, Milwaukee, Chap. 12; and Gerd Korman, Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers: The View from Milwaukee, 1866-1921 (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967), Chap. 2.

[44] Still, Milwaukee, p. 289; Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement, Chap. 6; and Jerry M. Cooper, "The Wisconsin National Guard in the Milwaukee Riots of 1886," Wisconsin Magazine of History 55 (Augumn 1971).

[45] Still, Milwaukee, Chap. 12; Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement, pp. 72-77.

[46] Federated Trades Council, Artisan Day Souvenir, n. p.

[47] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 21 Jan. 1894.

[48] This Milwaukee Socialist was quoted in the Kansas City Labor, 7 Dec. 1895. He added: "These are prosperous times in Milwaukee now, [since there are] 7,000 to 8,000 idle working men, roaming about the city, in search for work, have no homes, have nothing to subsist on, not even a place where they can lay their head for a night's rest."

[49] Federated Trades Council, Artisan Day Souvenir, n.p. I am indebted to Thomas Gavett's book for the initial lead on this citation.

[50] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 22 Nov. 1893; 25 Nov. 1893; and 21 Jan. 1894.

[51] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 13 Nov. 1893. Earlier in the month, on November 6, Berger editorialized that the People's Party was not as "progressive" as a Socialist party. Also see Frederick I. Olson, "Milwaukee's Socialist Mayors: End of an Era and Its Beginnings," Historical Messenger of the Milwaukee County Historical Society 16 (March 1960): 5.

[52] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 30 Apr. 1893; 10 Feb. 1894; and 1 Nov. 1896; and Frederick I. Olson, "The Milwaukee Socialists, 1897-1941," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952, p. 7; and,

for an examination of politics and athletics, Frank P. Ziedler, "When Milwaukee Turners Were More Than Gymnasts," Historical Messenger of the Milwaukee County Historical Society 11 (March 1955): 11-15.

[53] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 11 Feb. 1896.

[54] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 13 Nov. 1898; and also examine an important letter, "Secretary of Socialist Society to the Central Committee of the People's Party of Milwaukee, September 16, 1896," (William Pieplow Papers, Milwaukee County Historical Society, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Box 1, File 1).

[55] Milwaukee Socialist thought and action are best described in Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement; Still, Milwaukee, Chap. 12; Olson, "The Milwaukee Socialists," and Marvin Wachman, The History of the Social-Democratic Party of Milwaukee (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1945). A valuable biography of Victor Berger is by Sally M. Miller, Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism, 1910-1920 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973).

[56] Because scholars have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the new middle class like urban superintendents in school reform, there has not been sufficient attention given to the role of various community groups and labor unions in education in the Progressive era. An important essay which is interested in different questions about the working class and schooling is by David Hogan, "Education and the Making of the Chicago Working Class, 1880-1930," History of Education Quarterly 18 (Fall 1978): 227-270. John D. Buenker's Urban Liberalism and Progressive Reform (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1978) retrieves laborers from the dustbin of history but too often exaggerates their singular influence on Progressivism.

[57] Federated Trades Council Minutes, 19 Dec. 1900. (Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee Papers.)

[58] Die Munizipal-Platform der Sozial-Demokratischen von Milwaukee fur das Neujahr, 1904, n. p.

[59] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 16 Oct. 1895. Berger wryly noted that it was difficult for Milwaukee's workers to celebrate the city's golden anniversary when, as he estimated, "10,000 wage earners" were unemployed.

[60] Constitution and By-Laws of the Federated Trades Council of Wisconsin (Milwaukee: The Edward Keough Press, 1900), p. 4.

[61] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 24 Dec. 1899.

[62] Quoted in Rev. Orlo J. Price, "One Hundred Years of Protestantism in Rochester," in Centennial History of Rochester, New York ed. Edward P. Foreman, 4 vols. (Rochester: Printed by John P. Smith, Inc., 1933), 3: 241.

[63] Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper & Row, 1949).

[64] Arthur M. Schlesinger, A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c. 1967), p. 14. The literature on the rise of the Social Gospel is vast. In addition to May, Protestant Churches, see at least Charles Howard Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940); Aaron I. Abell, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943); and, more recently, Ronald C. White, Jr., and C. Howard Hopkins, The Social Gospel (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976).

[65] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 18 Dec. 1893. The wage earners adopted a resolution that attacked charity and demanded that workers "enjoy equal rights and privileges in the pursuit of happiness and enjoyment with any other class of citizens." For an excellent survey of local religious response to the working class, see Blake McKelvey, "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester," Rochester History 14 (October 1952): 1-27.

[66] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 29 Sept. 1894.

[67] Evening Bee, 26 Oct. 1893. The Bee's editorials urged workers to attend church, despite their differences with it.

[68] Federated Trades Council, Artisan Day Souvenir (Milwaukee: Federated Trades Council, 1895), p. 50.

[69] Kansas City Mail, 19 July 1892. In appraising different ways in which the church could end its estrangement with workers, the Star (24 Feb. 1895) concluded that formal religion currently lacked the proper emphasis on delivering a "spiritual" message to wage earners.

[70] Midland Mechanic, 13 Jan. 1898 and 26 Jan. 1899. In the former article entitled, "Christ a Vagabond," Rev. Myron Reed wrote: "What was Christ killed for, and who killed him...Right down at the bottom, Christ was killed for his sympathy with the poor and contempt for the rich and unjust. He was regarded by the respectable classes as an outlaw and a felon, and, if you please,

an anarchist."

[71] Report on Statistics of Churches in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1894), p. 91.

[72] McKelvey, The Flower City, p. 312; idem, "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester," pp. 1-27.

[73] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 May 1890.

[74] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 6 Oct. 1894. This Baptist, in line with religious commentary for the times, "asserted that the workingman was not to be found in the churches in any great numbers."

[75] Herbert G. Gutman, Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), Chap. 2.

[76] Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 9; and Schlesinger, "A Critical Period," p. 26, who argued that "these attempts to socialize Christian thought and practice, of course, represented the efforts of energetic minorities." For an international perspective, see Ralph Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp. 202-04.

[77] Patricia Youmans Wagner, "Voluntary Associations in Kansas City, Missouri, 1880-1900" Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas City, 1962, pp. 98-99. The Midland Mechanic, on October 13, 1898, went out of its way to call Rev. Northrup "the friend of the laboring classes." Also see Brown and Dorsett, K. C., p. 89. For information on other pro-working class members of the clergy and the rise of the Social Gospel, consult McKelvey, "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester," pp. 1-24; Downes, History of Lake Shore Ohio, 2: 510-11; Gordon A. Riegler, "The Story of Religion in Toledo, 1875-1900," Northwest Ohio Quarterly 25 (Autumn 1953): 218-39; idem, Northwest Ohio Quarterly 26 (Winter 1953-54): 69-99; Thelen, Origins of Progressivism, Chap. 5; and Hugh H. Knapp, "The Social Gospel in Wisconsin, 1890-1912," M. A. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1968. Nearly every standard secondary source on Progressive reform as a national phenomenon contains a section on the development of the Social Gospel.

[78] For a typical comment by a Universalist minister who leaned toward the Social Gospel, see "If Christ Came to Rochester" in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 Nov. 1894. On the civic and institutional church, read the representative essays by William T. Stead (who wrote the famous tract, If Christ Came to Chicago),

"Civic Church," Review of Reviews 8 (October 1893): 438-45; and P. Tyner, "Civic Church," Arena 17 (Fall 1897): 371-87.

[79] There is a wide literature on Golden Rule Jones but still no book length study, which should be rectified since Jones' massive papers are now available on microfilm. The interpretation that follows is based on his original writings and correspondence, supplemented with useful information drawn from the following works: Harvey S. Ford, "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953; George E. Mowry, The Era of Theodore Roosevelt (New York: Harper & Row, 1962); Melvin G. Holli, "Urban Reform in the Progressive Era," in The Progressive Era, ed. Lewis L. Gould (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974); Buenker, Urban Liberalism; Russel B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951); and James H. Rodabaugh, "Samuel M. Jones--Evangel of Equality," Northwest Ohio Quarterly 15 (January 1943): 17-46.

[80] Samuel M. Jones, The New Right: A Plea for Fair Play Through a More Just Social Order (New York: Eastern Book Concern, 1899), p. 43. Many of the most common details of Jones' life are contained in this work.

[81] Ford, The Life and Times," Chap. 1-3.

[82] Mrs. Edwin Hearth to Samuel M. Jones, August 29, 1897, (Samuel M. Jones Papers, Lucas County-Toledo Public Library, Toledo, Ohio. All of the letters cited in the remainder of this chapter are from this manuscript collection.) This particular letter was among the dozens of urgent pleas that he annually received for economic aid. Letters came not only from Toledoans and Ohioans but desperate people from all over the nation.

[83] Jones, The New Right, pp. 61-62.

[84] Jones to Henry Demorest Lloyd, May 28, 1897. In a letter to C. D. Wright, the United States Commissioner of Labor, on June 15, 1897, Jones argued that "the industrial depression is so great in this city and the surrounding country that I am [sic] lead to conclude that the number of men in enforced idleness at the present time is greater perhaps, as it seems to me, than at any other time in our history. I am something of a radical, and believe it is necessary to adopt radical measures to correct the unjust conditions that afflict us in many departments of our social life."

[85] Jones, The New Right, pp. 118-19. In his letters Jones continually complained that the economic system was out of harmony with Christian ethics, and no subject so preoccupied

his thoughts as that of unemployment. He believed that all able bodied people who wanted a job had a right to one; moreover, he encouraged unionism at a time when it was still regarded by many as subversive. In a letter to Frank W. Holmes, on July 6, 1897, in the matter of unemployment, Jones typically wrote: "To be contented while such injustice prevails around me seems to me a little short of being pagan, and I am utterly unable to understand how one can claim to be 'christian' at all, who is indifferent to this situation."

[86] Toledo Blade, 12 Nov. 1895. Over and over again in his correspondence, Jones praised Herron and argued that Herron first impressed upon him that an acceptance of the Fatherhood of God logically led to an acceptance of the Brotherhood of Man. See Jones to Rev. Crafts, October 28, 1897; Jones to George D. Herron, February 11, 1898; Jones to W. A. Kling, February 15, 1898; and Jones to W. R. Waddell, October 12, 1898.

[87] Jane Addams, Twenty Years at Hull House (New York: Signet Classics, 1961), p. 140.

[88] Jones to F. H. Boke, February 2, 1898. A characteristic statement by Jones on the failure of the churches to match up to the teachings of Christ can be found in a letter to James H. Hoadley, July 19, 1897. "I am becoming more and more impressed with the thought that the church is not 'christian'; that by separating life into fragments of sacred and secular she has misled the people, and there is very little of the christianity of the Carpenter of Nazareth, as I understand it, in our churches today."

[89] Jones to George P. Waldorf, October 11, 1899.

[90] Samuel M. Jones, Letters of Labor and Love (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Publisher, 1905), p. 59. See also Jones, The New Right, pp. 121, 227-28, and 401; and Frank Tracy Carlton, "Golden-Rule Factory," Arena 32 (October 1904): 408-10, for an examination of Jones' ideas in action.

[91] Jones, The New Right, pp. 227-228. Here Jones went on to complain that in most factories "men are treated as impersonal 'hands', not as brothers or human beings."

[92] Carlton, "Golden-Rule Factory," pp. 408-10; and Ernest Crosby, Golden Rule Jones (Chicago: The Public Publishing Company, 1906), pp. 12-15.

[93] Ford, "The Life and Times," pp. 90-91, who notes that Jones "infuriated" many of Toledo's ministers when he took out subscriptions of the Toledo Union for all of them.

[94] Samuel M. Jones, "No Title is Higher Than Man," a song found in the Jones Papers.

[95] Jones attacked the American Protective Association, racist bigots, and those who called immigrants "scum scrub." See Jones to Dr. J. Thomas Lee, September 29, 1898. To nativists, Jones simply responded: "I believe in Brotherhood, universal Brotherhood." On the affections of different ethnic groups to Jones, more will be said in later chapters.

[96] Jones to Rev. L. M. Fisk, February 2, 1898.

"Notes to Chapter 5"

[1] A wide variety of literature on the 1890s and Progressivism is cited throughout this study which describes these trends; on business consolidation, see Gabriel Kolko, The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1963).

[2] The importance of structural changes in school governance was largely ignored in the first major historical examination of Progressive education, Lawrence Cremin's The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962). This has been rectified in a so-called "revisionist" literature written from many different ideological perspectives. Compare, for example, Joel Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), Chap. 7; David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), Part 4; and Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, 1976), Chap. 7.

[3] Recent criticism of school board centralization is part of an older literature of dissent. See Scott Nearing, "Who's Who on Our Boards of Education," School and Society 5 (January 1917): 89-90; and George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927).

[4] Tyack, The One Best System, p. 77, passim; William Bullough, Cities and Schools in the Gilded Age (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1974), p. 75; and Clarence Karier et. al. Roots of Crisis (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973), p. 109, note 4. For numerous case studies within a similar theoretical perspective, also see Samuel P. Hays, "The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 55 (October 1964): 157-69; idem, "The Social Analysis of American Political History, 1880-1920," Political Science Quarterly 80 (September 1965): 383-84; Elinor Mondale Gersman, "Progressive Reform of the St. Louis School Board, 1897," History of Education Quarterly 10 (Spring 1970): 3-21; William H. Issel, "Modernization in Philadelphia School Reform, 1882-1905," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 94 (July 1970): 381-82; and Ronald M. Johnson, "Politics and Pedagogy: The 1892 Cleveland School Reform," Ohio History 84 (Autumn 1975): 196-206.

[5] Cf. much of the previously cited literature in this chapter. Though this analysis does not share her ideological defensiveness and support for centralization reforms, also see Diane Ravitch, The Revisionist Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the

Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1977), especially Chap. 7.

[6] Morton Keller, Affairs of State: Public Life in Late Nineteenth Century America (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 534.

[7] Blake McKelvey, "Rochester's Public Schools: A Testing Ground for Community Policies," Rochester History 31 (April 1969): 9-13; William J. Reese, "The Control of Urban School Boards During the Progressive Era: A Reconsideration," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 68 (October 1977): 164-74; Milwaukee School Report, 1897, pp. 58-64; and "Educational Organization and Progress in American Cities," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 25 (January 1905): 182.

[8] Although Wisconsin had a school suffrage law for women, it was essentially a dead letter. City directories and school reports constituted the major source materials for the collective biographies in this chapter.

[9] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 9 Apr. 1892.

[10] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 10 Jan. 1899. Graft and corruption were so common that President Nell added: "No deficiencies and no scandals attach to its business methods."

[11] Again, the names and occupations of school board members were examined in local school reports and city directories.

[12] The number of members on the school boards of different cities was usually identical with the number of established wards. Also see W. W. Chalmers, "Brief History of the Toledo Public Schools," in James J. Burns, ed. Educational History of Ohio (Columbus: Historical Publishing Company, 1905), p. 395.

[13] D. F. DeWolf, "Toledo," in Historical Sketches of Public Schools in Cities, Villages, and Townships of the State of Ohio (Columbus: Ohio State Centennial Educational Committee, 1876), p. 5.

[14] Charles Sumner Van Tassel, Story of the Maumee Valley, Toledo, and the Sandusky Region 2 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1929), 2: 1560.

[15] Toledo School Report, 1890, p. 11; and Peter J. Mettler, Chronik des Deutschen Pionier-Vereins von Toledo, Ohio (Toledo: Gilsdorf Printing Company, 1898), pp. 108-09. Zirwas was a long-term member of the Toledo school board, and he was always

singled out by Good Government reformers for his exemplary character and contributions to public education. See the Toledo Blade, 3 Feb. 1897.

[16] Patrick Donnelly, "The Milwaukee Public Schools," in John William Stearn, ed. The Columbian History of Education in Wisconsin (Milwaukee: Press of the Evening Wisconsin Company, 1893), pp. 462-63.

[17] American Industry and Manufactures in the 19th Century (Elmsford, New York: Maxwell Reprint Company, c. 1970), p. 988; and the appropriate table in the Appendix.

[18] The best analysis of the ward system is in Tyack, The One Best System. It is not as critical, however, as his interpretation of the Progressive era.

[19] Toledo School Report, 1896, p. 14. For a similar complaint on the inequalities that existed under the ward system, also see the report in Milwaukee School Proceedings, 2 May 1893.

[20] See, again, the appropriate literature on the social consequences of school board consolidation in footnotes 2, 3, and 4.

[21] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 21 June 1898.

[22] On the Toledo A.P.A. and Major's activities, see Henry J. Desmond, The A.P.A. Movement (Washington: The New Century Press, 1912), pp. 25-26, and 68-69; Donald L. Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Americanism: The American Protective Association (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), pp. 98-99; and Harvey S. Ford, "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953, pp. 81-84.

[23] For a detailed breakdown of the social origins of ward school board members in Toledo just prior to consolidation in 1898, see William J. Reese, "William Backus Guitteau and Educational Reform in Toledo During the Progressive Era," M.A. thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1975, pp. 36-61, 115-20.

[24] The Kansas City Labor Herald was a persistent critic of the school board in the Progressive era. More will be said about Kansas City trade unions and educational reform in later chapters, but the Herald's editorial on March 8, 1912 summarized a common complaint: "The dissatisfaction among the citizens of this city with the school board is becoming so strong as to command serious attention to the party representatives responsible for the situation. Instead of the board being servants of the people, they have become masters."

[25] Fourteen different city, county, and state histories of Missouri were used in assembling this collective biography, along with census materials, the annual city directories, and the Kansas City School Reports. Space limitations prohibit the formal listing of the various sources.

[26] Kansas City Times, 23 Sept. 1883; and 10 Mar. 1882, which contains the statement quoted at the head of this chapter.

[27] Kansas City Star, 21 Oct. 1891; and Pen and Sunlight Sketches of Kansas City and Environs (Chicago: Phoenix Publishing Co., 1892), p. 64; and Dorothy Galloway, "James Mickleborough Greenwood: An Evaluation of His Services as an Educator and His Contributions to Educational Thought," M.A. thesis, Washington University, 1931, pp. 16-17.

[28] A. J. D. Stewart, ed. The History of the Bench and Bar of Missouri (St. Louis: The Legal Publishing Co., 1898), in its biography of perennial board member Ronald L. Yeager, pp. 663-64; and "Educational Organization and Progress in American Cities," p. 182. Yeager's own business orientations are reflected in "School Boards, What and Why?" National Education Association Addresses and Proceedings (1896): 973-79.

[29] Kansas City Mail, 16 Feb. 1894; and the Labor Herald 20 July 1906; 15 Mar. 1912; and 27 Mar. 1914.

[30] Most popular historians and biographers of the Kansas City area viewed these developments uncritically. A characteristic view is by Carrie Westlake Whitney, Kansas City, Missouri, Its History and People 1808-1908 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1908), 1: 318. In reference to the bipartisan plan, she wrote: "The leading residents of Kansas City believed that the personnel of the school board should be free from the influences of politics and sectarianism." It was also free from ordinary people. A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Dorsett acknowledge the elite character of the board of education in K. C.: A History of Kansas City, Missouri (Boulder: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 84-85.

[31] Ibid. Also see "Educational Organization and Progress," pp. 182-83.

[32] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 7 Jan. 1899. The paper ran pro-centralization editorials and articles throughout January and February. "The people of Rochester demand a reorganized school board," it argued on January 24, "the general view seems to be that the present board is needlessly bulky, and represents respective localities rather than the city at large."

415

[33] Toledo Evening Bee, 25 Jan. 1898; Reese, "Another Look," pp. 165-66.

[34] Duane Mowry, "The Milwaukee School System," Educational Review 20 (Summer 1900): 147.

[35] Although historians have often commented on the role of Good Government associations in centralization reform, not enough attention has been placed on women's influence in social change. As was indicated in Chapter 3, women were active in almost every phase of educational change in urban education in the Progressive era.

[36] Tyack, The One Best System, p. 95.

[37] Dorothy S. Truesdale, "The Three R's in Rochester, 1850-1900," in Blake McKelvey, ed. The History of Education in Rochester (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939): 120-21. Typical examples of scandals and poor business practices for simply a short period of time are given in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 22 Mar. 1890; 30 Oct. 1890; 4 Nov. 1890; 6 Nov. 1890; 14 Nov. 1890; 19 Nov. 1890; and 12 Jan. 1891. In the article on November 4, the paper asserted that "the session of the Board of Education last evening was as harmonious as though an investigation of its proceedings was an unheard of matter."

[38] Examples are too numerous to cite. By the late 1890s competing newspapers were filled with essays on mayoral vetoes; and board members and the city administration exchanged many harsh words over the financial behavior of the ward leaders. The problem of nepotism in the Milwaukee schools is examined in Mark Van Pelt, "The Teacher and the Urban Community, 1860-1900," M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1978.

[39] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 Nov. 1890.

[40] Rochester School Report, 1891, p. 58.

[41] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 12 Jan. 1891; 13 Jan. 1891; 20 Jan. 1891; and 3 Feb. 1891. The records were stolen from the Free Academy, the building that housed the city high school and the place where the board kept its official documents. It was a classic example of having the foxes guard the chicken house.

[42] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 17 Feb. 1891. A similar action was taken by the Milwaukee school commissioners after August Schattenberg bilked the schools for over $40,000.

[43] The Toledo Blade and Toledo Evening Bee were filled with almost daily reports on the affairs of the school board and the progress of legislative reform in January, February, March, and April 1898. See, for example, the Bee for at least the following important issues: 25 Jan. 1898; 26 Jan. 1898; 27 Jan. 1898; 28 Jan. 1898; 29 Jan. 1898; 30 Jan. 1898; 31 Jan. 1898; 1 Feb. 1898; 2 Feb. 1898; 7 Feb. 1898; 9 Feb. 1898; 17 Feb. 1898; 18 Feb. 1898; 19 Feb. 1898; 6 Mar. 1898; and 23 Mar. 1898. Besides Reese, "Another Look," pp. 164-74, also see idem, "Progressive School Reform in Toledo, 1898-1921," Northwest Ohio Quarterly 47 (Spring 1975): 44-59.

[44] Quoted in Ford, "The Life and Times," p. 178.

[45] In the early Seventies, for example, the Seebote attacked members of the school board for land swindles and backroom deals, as cited in the Milwaukee Sentinel, 17 Feb. 1872. Also see Mowry, "The Milwaukee School System," p. 141; William Lamers, Our Roots Grow Deep (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools, 1974), p. 84; and Jerome A. Watrous, ed. Memoirs of Milwaukee County 2 vols. (Madison, Wi: Western Historical Association, 1909), 1: 406.

[46] Proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee (Milwaukee, 1890), 16 Dec. 1899. The vote was 17 to 16. William Geuder, a prominent German school commissioner, mentions the scandal in the Milwaukee School Proceedings, 5 May 1891. Also see the Milwaukee Daily News, 7 May 1890 and 1 Apr. 1892; Milwaukee Sentinel, 6 May 1891. Compare the assessment of one of Schattenberg's contemporaries, Watrous, Memoirs, 1: 406.

[47] "Milwaukee Letter," Wisconsin Journal of Education 20 (January 1890): 24.

[48] An important analysis of mugwumpery and its relationship to Good Government reforms is by David Thelen, The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900 (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974), Chap. 8.

[49] Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), Chap. 4; Edward W. Stevens, Jr., "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1917: An Historical Perspective on Social Control in Public Education," Ed.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971, pp. 30-31; Randolph Downes, Industrial Beginnings (Toledo: Toledo Printing Company, 1954), pp. 157-58; Bayrd Still, Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), pp. 299-301; Thelen, The New Citizenship, Chap. 8; Kansas City Star 25 Jan. 1892; and Kansas City Mail, 16 Feb. 1894.

[50] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 19 Jan. 1894.

[51] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 8 Feb. 1894.

[52] The plan was described in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 23 Nov. 1894. On Aldridge, pertinent studies include McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, passim; idem, "Rochester's Public Schools," p. 9; idem, "The Mayors of Rochester's Mid Years: 1860-1900," Rochester History 27 (January 1966): 21-24; and idem, "Rochester at the Turn of the Century," Rochester History 12 (January 1950): 8-9.

[53] Rochester School Report, 1894, p. 49; and Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 10 Mar. 1894.

[54] Rochester School Report, 1895, pp. 69, 93. Also see the reaction of the school commissioners to various proposals for reorganization in the Rochester School Report, 1898, pp. 152-53.

[55] Rochester School Report, 1898, pp. 152-53. Commissioner Dow, who drafted different aspects of a reorganization plan that ultimately bore his name, diligently tried to interest fellow commissioners in reform. At one particular meeting, he tried to hold a session to consider reorganization, but "few accepted the invitation. School reform, apparently, does not strike a responsive chord in the hearts of most of the members of the board," See the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 18 Jan. 1898.

[56] Rochester School Report, 1898, p. 153. The usual comment was still added: "No persons familiar with school affairs or school management [sic] was consulted" in the preparation of the final bill.

[57] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 1 May 1898. Also consult McKelvey, "Rochester's Public Schools," p. 9, where he argues: "Frustrated by continued bickering, the Good Government forces accepted the promise of Aldridge of a free hand in the schools if they would back his nominees for Council." Other relevant sources include "The Laws of 1898, As Amended by the Laws of 1900 and 1901," in Rochester School Report, 1902, pp. 5-33; A. Laura McGregor, "History of the Public Schools of Rochester, New York," in George R. Foreman, ed. Centennial History of Rochester, New York 4 vols. (Rochester: Printed by John P. Smith Co., 1934), 4: 179; and Herbert S. Weet "The Development of Public Education in Rochester, 1900-1910," in McKelvey, The History of Education in Rochester, pp. 183-86.

[58] McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, 84-85. According to McKelvey, there was proof that the clause was added by the state

printer at the request of Boss Aldridge and representatives of the American Book Company.

[59] Tyack, The One Best System, provides an excellent examination of the vacuousness of centralizers' arguments in the area of "non-partisanship," one in which many subsequent historians have fully concurred. A convenient synopsis of Tyack's important contributions and scholarship on the Progressive era is in David B. Tyack, Michael W. Kirst, and Elisabeth Hansot, "Educational Reform: Retrospect and Prospect," Teachers College Record 81 (Spring 1980): 257-59.

[60] The Toledo Evening Bee (21 Jan. 1896) wrote an incisive editorial on Major's plans in the heat of political debate. Also see this newspaper for 18 Sept. 1895 and 25 Sept. 1895; as well as the Republican Blade for 23 Jan. 1896; 24 Jan. 1896; and 25 Jan. 1896; and Hoyt Landon Warner, Progressivism in Ohio, 1897-1919 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1964), pp. 13, 25.

[61] On the issue of bi-partisanship, consult McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, p. 83. For the Toledo scene, see Reese, "Another Look," p. 165.

[62] Toledo Blade, 23 Mar. 1895.

[63] Toledo Evening Bee, 26 Jan. 1898.

[64] Toledo Evening Bee, 3 April 1898; and 19 Apr. 1898; Toledo Blade, 18 Apr. 1898; Downes, Industrial Beginnings, pp. 207-212; idem, "The People's Schools: Popular Foundations of Toledo's Public School System," Northwest Ohio Quarterly 29 (Winter 1956-1957): 12-13; W. W. Chalmers, "Brief History of the Toledo Public Schools," p. 395; and Reese, "Progressive School Reform in Toledo," pp. 44-59.

[65] See Samuel M. Jones' mayoral addresses for some of his public positions on the Niles Bill, especially Annual Statements of the Finances of Toledo (Toledo, 1898), p. 22; Annual Statements of the Finances of Toledo (Toledo, 1901), p. 16; and Annual Statements of the Finances of Toledo (Toledo, 1902), p. 28.

[66] Toledo Evening Bee, 26 Mar. 1898. Jones' public life and activities have been well documented. See especially Ford, "The Life and Times"; Wendell F. Johnson, Toledo's Non-Partisan Movement (Toledo: Press of H. J. Crittenden Co., 1922); Brand Whitlock, "'Golden Rule' Jones," World's Work 8 (September 1904): 5308-311; Peter Jerome Frederick, "European Influences on the Awakening of the American Social Conscience, 1886-1904," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California-Berkeley, 1966, Chap. 9;

and Gary Bailey, "The Toledo Independent Movement: A Test of the Urban Liberalism Thesis," M.A. thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1977.

[67] The Toledo Union, 19 Mar. 1898.

[68] Downes, "The People's Schools," pp. 13-14. For a small sampling, for example, see especially Toledo Building Trades Council to Jones, March 10, 1899; Granite Cutters National Union to Jones, March 17, 1899; and Knights of Labor to Jones, March 28, 1899. (Samuel M. Jones Papers, Lucas County-Toledo Public Library, Toledo, Ohio.)

[69] Tucker's life and activities in the schools are easily traced in Nevin O. Winter, A History of Northwest Ohio 3 vols. (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1917), 2: 676; J. Hazard Perry and Mason Warner, The Lincoln Club (Toledo: Warner and Perry, 1899), pp. 353-54; and Harvey Schribner, Memoirs of Lucas County and the City of Toledo 2 vols. (Madison, Wi.: Western Historical Association, 1910), 2: 518-19. See also the detailed information in Tucker's obituary in the Blade 12 Jan. 1921.

[70] Toledo Blade, 28 Jan. 1898. The Blade editorialized that Tucker could not read the handwriting on the wall and called him a demagogue who failed to see that nepotism and paternalism, not representative government, was really the heart of the ward system he defended. The Evening Bee (28 Jan. 1898 and 1 Feb. 1898) similarly lashed out at the "Tucker gang" that ran the schools. Although Tucker's defense of the ward system was bold and highly principled, somehow he forgot that just two years earlier he had attacked the inequitable distribution of school resources under that very system. See the Toledo School Report, 1896, pp. 14-15.

[71] Toledo Blade, 27 Jan. 1898.

[72] Jones helped Tucker and his followers secure legislation for some district representation on the school board in 1904. Jones' Complete Education League, a social service organization comprised of many liberal and radical men and women, organized soon after the election of a business-dominated, efficiency-minded board in 1898.

[73] John A. Butler, "School System," Annals of the American Academy 25 (January 1905): 171-79. Butler was a Yale educated attorney who was the leader of the Municipal League, and his background and activities are well described in Thelen, The New Citizenship, Chap. 7.

[74] Milwaukee School Report, 1872, p. 70; Milwaukee School Proceedings, 14 Feb. 1887, which has a good statement on the importance of geographical representation in democratic government; and reactions to other plans on 7 Feb. 1888; 5 Feb. 1889; 20 Feb. 1889; and 7 May 1889. Much more will be said of the influence of the Socialist working class in direct election plans in future chapters.

[75] Milwaukee School Report, 1872, p. 70.

[76] See especially the citations in note 72.

[77] Milwaukee School Proceedings, 7 May 1889; 5 July 1892; and 19 Mar. 1895.

[78] Much of this analysis was documented in the preceding chapter.

[79] Milwaukee Daily News, 20 Apr. 1897. The News wrote a long anti-commission editorial on February 10, 1897, which also attacked the present system of appointment by the ward aldermen. It called for the direct election of all boards of education by the people. An older historian, Jerome A. Watrous, wrote in 1909 that "the law of 1897 caused considerable popular dissatisfaction, many people contending that the school directors ought to be elected by a vote of the people." See Memoirs of Milwaukee County, 1: 407.

[80] Wisconsin Vorwarts, 20 Apr. 1897.

[81] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 15 Feb. 1898 and 14 May 1898; "Minutes of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union," 1893-1896 volume, p. 165 (Women's Educational and Industrial Union Papers, Rochester Public Library, Rochester, New York); and Mrs. Henry G. Danforth, "Rochester's Gay Nineties," Rochester Historical Society Publications 20 (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1942): 47.

[82] Toledo Evening Bee, 15 Mar. 1898; and Toledo Blade, 2 Apr. 1898.

[83] The Woman's School Alliance support for the commission plan was documented in the Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Clubs (Berlin, Wi.: Printed by George C. Hicks, 1897), pp. 34-35.

"Notes to Introduction to Part 3"

[1] "The School Community Plan," School Journal 62 (February 2, 1901): 128.

[2] Although these sources do not exhaust the voluminous literature on Progressivism, see at least the following: Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967); Gabriel Kolko, The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963); James Weinstein, The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968); Robert Wiebe, Businessmen and Reform: A Study of the Progressive Movement (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1962); Richard Hofstadter The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. (New York: Vintage Books, 1955); Lewis L. Gould, ed., The Progressive Era (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974); John D. Buenker, John C. Burnham, and Robert M. Crunden, Progressivism (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1977); and John D. Buenker, Urban Liberalism and Progressive Reform (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1973).

"Notes to Chapter 6"

[1] There is a wide literature on the significance of municipal reform movements in the Progressive era. See, for example, Russell B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951); George E. Mowry, The Era of Theodore Roosevelt (New York: Harper & Row, 1962); John D. Buenker, Urban Liberalism and Progressive Reform (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1973); Melvin G. Holli, "Urban Reform in the Progressive Era," in Lewis L. Gould, ed. The Progressive Era (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974); and the new interpretations in Michael H. Ebner and Eugene M. Tobin, eds. The Age of Urban Reform: New Perspectives on the Progressive Era (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1977).

[2] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 28 December 1897.

[3] David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), Part 4. The literature on the period is too extensive for full documentation. See, however, at least the following: Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962); Edward Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); Joel Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972); Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, 1976); and Paul C. Violas, Education and the Training of the Urban Working Class (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978).

[4] John Dewey, "The School as a Center of Social Life," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1902): 373, 380.

[5] See especially Cremin, The Transformation, p. viii. Cremin noted the importance of new social services and innovations in his introduction but did not examine the rates at which different changes entered the schools in different rural and urban environments. More analysis of the claim of social "transformation" will be made in later chapters.

[6] Much of the literature on the expansion of school programs and services is cited in note 2. See especially Krug's history of the high school, which is really a comprehensive study which ranges far beyond secondary education, one of the most notable areas of growth during these years. Spring's Education and Rise of the Corporate State and Violas' Education and the Training of the Working Class should be contrasted with the viewpoints in this study with respect to social services.

[7] On Milwaukee, examine Bayrd Still, Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948); Thomas G. Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement in Milwaukee (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965); Gerd Korman, Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers: The View From Milwaukee, 1866-1921 (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967); and Frederick I. Olson, "The Milwaukee Socialists, 1897-1941," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952. Toledo has a less well-developed historical literature than Milwaukee. A number of valuable sources nevertheless remains useful in gaining a general understanding of the city in the Progressive era. See, for example, Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics; Hoyt Landon Warner, Progressivism in Ohio, 1897-1917 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1964); Jack Tager, The Intellectual as Urban Reformer: Brand Whitlock and the Progressive Movement (Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve, 1968); Robert M. Crunden, A Hero in Spite of Himself: Brand Whitlock in Art, Politics, and War (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969); Harvey S. Ford, "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953; and Gary Bailey, "The Toledo Independent Movement: A Test of the Urban Liberalism Thesis," M.A. thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1977.

[8] The best literature on the period is A. Laura McGregor, "History of the Public Schools of Rochester, New York," in George R. Foreman, ed. Centennial History of Rochester, New York 4 vols. (Rochester: Printed by John P. Smith Company, 1934), 4: 171-88; Herbert S. Weet, "The Development of Public Education in Rochester, 1900-1910," in Blake McKelvey, ed. The History of Education in Rochester (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939), pp. 183-232; Blake McKelvey, "Rochester's Public Schools: A Testing Ground for Community Policies," Rochester History 31 (April 1969): 9-15; and idem, Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956). Also see William J. Reese, "The Social Center Movement and Progressive Reform," in Diane Ravitch and Ronald Goodenow, eds., The Community Study of Urban Educational History (New York: Teachers College Press, forthcoming).

[9] Labor Herald 14 Nov. 1919; and Kansas City School Report, 1914, pp. 29-32; Kansas City School Report, 1916, pp. 19-46; and Cammack's long statements in the foreward to Kansas City and Its Schools (Kansas City: Prepared for the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, 1917).

[10] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 17 Feb. 1899. On women's increased emphasis on voluntary association, see also the Toledo Blade, 13 May 1902, which described "a decided quickening of club interest in Toledo." The Milwaukee Sentinel (23 Oct. 1907) as well as other Wisconsin dailies contrasted the power of women in social reform after the turn of the century to earlier days, while the Kansas City Daily Journal (8 Mar. 1901) noted the

phenomenal growth of mothers' unions in Missouri. Women's role in school reform in Kansas City is fully acknowledged in *Kansas City and Its Schools*, pp. 88-90.

[11] *Child-Welfare Magazine* 13 (1919): 330; and *Kansas City and Its Schools*, pp. 89-90.

[12] "Men Like Sam Jones Do No Good," *The Socialist*, 25 Mar. 1905. This newspaper had a short-lived career in Toledo. Reactions to Jones' death and long descriptions of his funeral procession are available in the mid-July 1904 issues of the *Toledo News-Bee* and the *Blade*. Also see Brand Whitlock, *Forty Years of It* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1914), p. 139; and idem, "'Golden Rule' Jones," *World's Work* 8 (September 1904): 5308-11.

[13] Besides Victor Berger's own *Broadsides* (Milwaukee: Social Democratic Press, 1913) and his many editorials in the local newspapers, the next best introduction to his life is the fine biography by Sally M. Miller, *Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973). Also see several of the secondary sources cited in note 7.

[14] See, for example, Herbert N. Casson, "Draining a Political Swamp in Toledo," *Arena* 21 (June 1899): 768-71; Washington Gladden, "Mayor Jones of Toledo," *Outlook* 62 (May 6, 1899): 17-21; "The Late Mayor Jones," *Independent* 42 (July 21, 1904): 162-63; Frank Tracy Carlton, "Golden Rule Factory," *Arena* 32 (October 1904): 408-10; Ernest Crosby, *Golden Rule Jones* (Chicago: The Public Publishing Company, 1906); and Wendell F. Johnson, *Toledo's Non-Partisan Movement* (Toledo: Press of the H. J. Chittenden Co., 1922). For secondary accounts peruse the literature in note 7.

[15] Anti-partyism was a mainstay in Jones' thinking after he bolted from the Republican Party in 1899. This perspective was confirmed in his many writings as well as in his personal correspondence. Typical viewpoints were included in Jones' "Government by the Golden Rule," *Munsey* 28 (January 1903): 506-09; and the Republican dominated realities are documented in John M. Killits, *Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio, 1623-1923* 3 vols. (Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1952), 2: 578-79; and Randolph Downes, *Industrial Beginnings* (Toledo: Toledo Printing Company, 1954), pp. 162-68. Also see Ford, "The Life and Times," Chap. 10, for an analysis of the circumstances causing Jones' break from the Republicans.

[16] Letters include Eugene Debs to Samuel M. Jones, March 6, 1899; and Samuel M. Jones to Eugene Debs, 30 Dec. 1898. (Jones Papers). Jones was an admirer of Debs, who occasionally spoke

to Toledo citizens at his request.

[17] In "The Toledo Independent Movement," p. 21, Gary Bailey notes that Jones' popularity with the citizenry probably would have kept him in office indefinitely. Jones died of complications arising from pneumonia and a recurrent asthmatic condition.

[18] The context is described in William J. Reese, "The Control of Urban School Boards during the Progressive Era," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 68 (October 1977): 166-172. The Democratic Evening Bee was especially critical of the Hamilton-era boards, arguing on several occasions that business principles were fine but not when they froze children in the buildings and stood in the way of educational innovation. See especially the editorials and news reports on the huge debates which occurred between the Complete Education League and Hamilton, 23 Mar. 1902; 24 Mar. 1902; 3 Apr. 1902; and 4 Apr. 1902. Undoubtedly the fact that the school board was primarily Republican after 1898 fueled the flames of discontent. The Bee nevertheless refused to nominate party members for office (fulfilling the spirit of the Niles Bill) and continually endorsed the major programs of the new education. Setting itself up as the "champion of the children" in 1898, it called for playgrounds, social centers, evening schools, manual training and domestic science programs; it later endorsed medical and dental inspection, school gardens, and lunch programs. It similarly championed parent teacher associations, teacher unions, and most of the principles of the Complete Education League. The list of citations on these programs is much too long to cite here, yet the Bee's overall position was best expressed on April 4, 1900, when it urged parents to "Kick a few holes in that system." Its rival, the Republican Blade, was on the whole more supportive of business efficiency and suspicious of many of the programs of the new education.

[19] Toledo Blade, 21 May 1901, where Law added: "Electing members at large is an improvement upon the old ward plan of representation, but the board, as at present constituted, is too small, and the term, five years is too long, and the plan of electing but one member a year is destructive of progress or change." Earlier the Evening Bee (20 Mar. 1900) aptly noted that the idea of "taking the schools out of politics" was in practice a euphemism for taking Democrats out of politics; they were virtually excluded from the school board because of the Niles Bill. Four out of five members in 1900 were Republicans, and the Bee claimed along with many that it was "pretty much of an old fogey board" interested in "false economy" and "slave driving." (25 Mar. 1900).

[20] Quoted in Randolph Downes, "The People's Schools: Popular Foundations of Toledo's Public School System," Northwest Ohio Quarterly 29 (Winter 1956-1957): 13.

[21] Ibid.

[22] The Broadway Civic Club, like so many parent organizations in history, failed to leave any manuscript collections or minute books. The use of contemporary newspapers, however, helps retrieve them from the dustbin of educational history, since they regularly reported on the activities of these associations in columns devoted to voluntary association work. On the Broadway Civic Club, the most useful of dozens of available articles are in the Toledo Evening Bee, 7 Feb. 1898; 7 Mar. 1898; 16 Mar. 1899; 17 Sept. 1899; 15 Mar. 1900; 13 May 1900; 15 Feb. 1901; and 14 Feb. 1905. While applauding the elimination of the Hamilton board and endorsing the election of a more Progressive school board in 1905 (in the last article cited), the Club praised the new educational policy of "recognizing the equal rights of children, parents, and teachers."

[23] Toledo Bee, 23 Mar. 1902. Like the Broadway Civic Club, newspaper reports of meetings are the only reliable records of the C.E.L. activities along with minutes of the Toledo school board. Though the sources are extensive, see especially "Complete Education," in the Toledo Blade, 17 Jan. 1900 and 6 Feb. 1900; Toledo Evening Bee, 17 Jan. 1900; 28 Feb. 1900; 29 Mar. 1900; 19 Nov. 1901; 23 Feb. 1902; and 23 Mar. 1902. The struggles of the League with the school board can be traced in the Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 5 Feb. 1900; 19 Feb. 1900; 19 Mar. 1900; 16 Apr. 1900; 7 May 1900; 17 Sept. 1900; 18 Nov. 1901; 21 Apr. 1902; and 15 Dec. 1902. (Center for Archival Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio).

[24] Samuel M. Jones to William H. Rice, February 10, 1899, where the Golden Rule Mayor also provided a variant form of the poem found at the heading of this chapter. Also consult Jones' First Annual Message of Mayor Samuel M. Jones to the Common Council of Toledo, Ohio (Toledo, 1898), p. 14; Second Annual Message of Samuel M. Jones, Mayor (Toledo, 1899), pp. 14-23; and Sixth Annual Message of Samuel M. Jones, Mayor of Toledo, Delivered to the Common Council, March 2, 1903 (Toledo, 1903), p. 13. All of these materials are found in the Jones Papers.

[25] Fifth Annual Message, Samuel M. Jones, Mayor of Toledo, Ohio, for the Year 1901 (Toledo, 1901), p. 4.

[26] Toledo Evening Bee, 17 Jan. 1900 and 24 May 1900; and Toledo Blade, 17 Jan. 1900 and 8 Feb. 1900. More attention will be paid to their support for the reforms enumerated in the text in later chapters.

[27] Complete Education (February 1902), quoted in the Toledo Evening Bee, 23 Feb. 1902.

[28] According to several newspaper reports, the club often met at Segur's house. Her involvement in the organization was traced in the Toledo Evening Bee, 12 Oct. 1898; 6 Mar. 1899; 15 Feb. 1901; and in the Toledo Blade, 11 Oct. 1900; 7 May 1901; 7 Jan. 1902; and 11 Jan. 1902. Like so many other clubwomen, Segur agitated for higher pay and tenure provisions for public school teachers.

[29] Samuel M. Jones to James H. Ferris, December 16, 1898. In a letter to Gerinne Brown, March 2, 1898, Jones believed that women's clubs would be a powerful source of social change in many cities during his lifetime. The importance of the Golden Rule and family metaphors in Jones' views on women are explored in Ford, "The Life and Times."

[30] Samuel M. Jones to Walter L. Young, July 19, 1899.

[31] Most of this information has been pieced together through newspaper reports on the lives of these women. Segur was very active in suffrage associations from after the time of the Civil War. Steinem's life is examined in Elaine S. Anderson, "Pauline Steinem, Dynamic Immigrant," in Marta Whitlock, ed. Women in Ohio History (Columbus: The Ohio Historical Society, 1976), pp. 13-19. As briefly mentioned in earlier chapters, Law was a former Toledo school teacher who operated a kindergarten training school and unsuccessfully ran for the school board in 1898. Another prominent clubwoman and suffrage leader was Kate Sherwood, who was the most outspoken supporter of labor unions and working people of all of these women; her husband was the preeminent labor representative in Congress for the Toledo area during the Progressive era. All of these women were active in the work of the Complete Education League.

[32] Anderson, "Pauline Steinem," pp. 13-19. Through the work of Sherwood and Steinem in particular, the City Federation of Women's Clubs had a Complete Education division by May of 1901. See the Toledo Blade, 22 May 1901.

[33] Long eulogies on the death of Mrs. Sherwood provide useful information on her life. They are found in the Toledo Union Leader, 20 Feb. 1914; in the Toledo News-Bee, 18 Feb. 1914; and in the Toledo Blade, 16 Feb. 1914. The Blade gave some solid reasons for her friendship to Jones when it argued that while technically a Presbyterian, in reality she practiced religious tolerance and love for all people. "She was a Christian Socialist in the broad meaning, or, as she said herself, 'a primitive Christian,' in that she took the teachings of Christ literally and gave to the needy to the limit of her means." Sherwood marched in many labor day parades and helped energize women's clubs to boycott anti-union shops in the city on different occasions. The Evening Bee reported on March 16, 1899, that

the Broadway Civic Club had unanimously backed Jones' candidacy for mayor. On the cooperation of different groups on the restoration of district representation, consult Downes, "The People's Schools," p. 13; and the numerous articles on the subject in the Toledo Blade and News-Bee in January, February, and March of 1904.

[34] Warner, Progressivism in Ohio, pp. 10-11. Jones' refusal to enforce Sunday closing laws was the major public source of disagreement with the Pastor's Union, which in turn refused to congratulate him when he was elected to office, contrary to past policy. Jones regarded the saloons as the "poor man's club."

[35] Like many Social Gospelers, Jones believed that the churches had veered from the primitive Christian perspectives of Jesus Christ. As a result he argued that workers would only return to the fold in large numbers when the churches rediscovered their roots and became part of working-class life. See "Why Do Not People Go to Church?" in the Evening Bee, 28 May 1899. In addition consult Samuel M. Jones, The New Right: A Plea for Fair Play Through a More Just Social Order (New York: Eastern Book Concern, 1899); and "American Workingmen and Religion," Outlook 65 (July 14, 1900): 640-42.

[36] Brand Whitlock to Rev. Thomas H. Campbell, January 7, 1905, in Allan Nevins, ed. The Letters and Journal of Brand Whitlock (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1936), p. 40.

[37] As Jones told Washington Gladden on April 20, 1897, "I seem to think of nothing better at present than to use my utmost endeavor, through progressive or radical utterances, if you please, to call the attention of the people to the conditions as they exist around us." Writing to H. V. Caton on December 19, 1898, he wrote: "You look upon the situation exactly as I do; this office is a pulpit, from which I am preaching the gospel of liberty for all people more effectively than I could do in private life."

[38] Toledo Evening Bee, 7 Apr. 1903.

[39] Brand Whitlock, in the unpaginated introduction to Samuel M. Jones, Letters of Labor and Love (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1905).

[40] Whitlock's life is well described in Tager, The Intellectual as Urban Reformer; Crunden, A Hero in Spite of Himself; Bailey, "The Toledo Independent Movement"; Randolph C. Downes, History of Lake Shore Ohio 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1952), 2: 413-15; and Killits, ed. Toledo and Lucas County, vol. 2, pp. 580-84. Documentation of

429

sources on Whitlock's support for specific Progressive educational reforms will appear in later chapters.

[41] Robert F. Hoxie, "The Rising Ride of Socialism," The Journal of Political Economy 19 (October 1911): 609-31. Milwaukee had "more than one-eighth of all the Socialists in office."

[42] Gavett, Development of the Labor Movement, Chaps. 10-11; Frederick Howe, "Milwaukee: A Socialist City," Outlook 95 (June 25, 1910): 411-21; George Allen England, "Milwaukee's Socialist Government," Review of Reviews 42 (October 1910): 445-55; "A Socialist City in America," World's Work 20 (June 1910): 12995-12996; and the Social Democrats' own History of the Milwaukee Social Democratic Victories (Milwaukee: Social Democratic Publishing Company, 1911). The importance of Milwaukee in the Socialist movement in the Progressive era is undeniable. For a framework for Socialist development in Milwaukee and in the nation, at least read the following: Howard Quint, The Forging of American Socialism (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1953); David Shannon, The Socialist Party of America (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1944); Daniel Bell, Marxian Socialism in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967); James Weinstein, The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925 (New York: Vintage Books, 1967); David Herreshoff, American Disciples of Marx: From the Age of Jackson to the Progressive Era (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1967); and the essays in Bruce M. Stave, ed. Socialism and the Cities (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1975), especially Sally M. Miller, "Milwaukee: Of Ethnicity and Labor," pp. 41-71.

[43] Milwaukee Leader, 7 July 1915.

[44] Quoted in Still, Milwaukee, p. 312.

[45] Elizabeth H. Thomas, "The Milwaukee Election," International Socialist Review 4 (March 1904): 520-21.

[46] Undated pamphlet entitled Rose on Socialism, p. 1, in the Milwaukee pamphlet collection at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. The close ties of working people and the S.D.P. is highlighted in Carl D. Thompson, Labor Measures of the Social-Democrats (ca. 1911), p. 3.

[47] Victor Berger, "What is the Matter with Milwaukee?" Independent 68 (April 21, 1910): 841.

[48] Maude G. Brown, "A History of Organized Labor in Toledo," M.A. thesis, University of Toledo, 1924, p. 56. The Central Labor Union voted over three to one in favor of supporting the

State Socialist ticket, according to the Toledo Union Leader, 24 July 1908. Most major newspapers of the day in Toledo opposed the entry of labor into "politics." The opposition of the Toledo News-Bee (31 Oct. 1908) was based on the fear of less working-class support for the Independents in favor of a more radical political party.

[49] Jones told the Toledo Blade on January 24, 1899 that he did not belong to any Socialist party primarily because he feared that such a party would be based on class hatred, something which was incompatible with Jesus' law of love for all human beings. On many occasions Jones argued that he loved all men, even if he believed that the wealthy and powerful often erred and were misguided on social issues. According to the Evening Bee (11 Dec. 1899) a Toledo Socialist Club was formed later that year, and the Toledo Saturday Night, a paper which was unofficially a Jones' organ, noted that the Socialist Labor Party had attacked Jones for refusing to join a radical political party (10 June 1899). The Socialist, in turn, tried to argue on March 25, 1905, that Jones was a capitalist exploiter of labor; it reluctantly admitted that he had become a living legend in Toledo because of his Golden Rule factory and actions as mayor.

[50] Quoted in James Dombroski, The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), p. 137.

[51] Jones' refusal has already been substantiated in previous footnotes. Whitlock's refusal to join was indicated in a letter to the editor of the Toledo News-Bee, 25 Jan. 1913. Whitlock argued that if he belonged to any party he would then not be the mayor of all of the people.

[52] Roderick Nash, "Victor L. Berger: Making Marx Respectable," Wisconsin Magazine of History 47 (Summer 1964): 301-08. Sally Miller's biography, Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism, is a valuable inquiry into the problem of whether individuals can morally live in an immoral world, a problem faced by Berger and many reformers throughout history.

[53] F.T.C. Minutes, 18 Sept. 1901. (Federated Trades Council Papers).

[54] Social Democratic Herald, 7 Dec. 1901. Other examples of S.D.P. preference for evolution over revolution were registered in its newspaper on 28 June 1902; 31 Oct. 1903; 30 Dec. 1905; and 23 May 1908; and in the Milwaukee Leader, 7 Dec. 1911; Berger, Broadsides, pp. 3, 29, 41-42, and 228-29; Miller, Victor Berger, Chap. 2; and "Milwaukee's Socialist Mayor," Current Literature 48 (May 1910): 477-78.

[55] Emil Seidel, Sketches From My Life, Vol. 2, pp. 79-80, an unpublished autobiography written in 1938. (Emil Seidel Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin).

[56] History of the Milwaukee Social-Democratic Victories, p. 16; Social Democratic Herald, 23 May 1908; and Miller, Victor Berger, Chap. 1.

[57] David Montgomery, Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 70-72.

[58] James R. Green, The World of the Worker: Labor in Twentieth Century America (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), p. 80.

[59] Social Democratic Herald, 1 July 1905. The increasing variety of social welfare and education services in the S.D.P. platforms is easily traced in the Milwaukee Vorwarts, 1 Apr. 1900; 4 Feb. 1906; and 8 Mar. 1908.

[60] See in particular the Social Democratic Herald, 1 July 1905; 6 Apr. 1907; and the Milwaukee Leader, 22 Mar. 1913; 22 Jan. 1914; 9 Mar. 1915; 5 Jan. 1917; 10 Mar. 1917; and 15 Mar. 1917.

[61] Milwaukee Leader, 5 Jan. 1917.

[62] Milwaukee Leader, 14 Oct. 1913. The Federated Trades Council, demonstrating the continuing power of Christian ethics among workers, argued: "Urge in the name of justice that everything be done before the dispensation of charity, for in the language of the proverbs be it said: "'Give us neither poverty nor riches.'" (F.T.C. Minutes, 17 Dec. 1913).

[63] History of the Milwaukee Social-Democratic Victories, pp. 9-10, 45-46; and Olson, "The Milwaukee Socialists," pp. 81-83. As the History stated (p. 45): "Scores of hall meetings of all sizes were held in every nook and corner of the city, and the poeple addressed on the issues of the campaign from a workingclass standpoint in whatever language the people of a given section could best understand." The industrialist referred to was George Bruce, quoted in the Social Democratic Herald, 13 May 1905.

[64] See, for example, Korman, Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers, pp. 52-53. The literature is surveyed and analyzed extensively in Donald Pienkos, "Politics, Religion, and Change in Polish Milwaukee, 1900-1930," Wisconsin Magazine of History 61 (Spring 1978): 179-209.

[65] Gavett, Development, pp. 24-26; and History of the Social-Democratic Victories, pp. 14, 35-39. On the Germans and Poles in Milwaukee, see Kathleen Neils Conzen, Immigrant Milwaukee, 1836-1880 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); and Roger David Simon, "The Expansion of an Industrial City: Milwaukee, 1880-1910," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1971, Chap. 2.

[66] The Socialist concern with organizing the Poles is revealed in the F.T.C. Minutes, 2 Oct. 1907. On Catholic opposition to Socialism, see the Social Democratic Herald, 12 Mar. 1904; 21 Jan. 1905; 1 July 1905; 20 Mar. 1909; and 25 Mar. 1911; and the Milwaukee Leader, 16 Nov. 1912; 28 Jan. 1914; 16 Mar. 1915; and 4 Apr. 1917; as well as Reverend Benjamin J. Blied, Three Archbishops of Milwaukee (Milwaukee, 1955), pp. 132-33, 141.

[67] Milwaukee Leader, 29 Sept. 1912; Olson, "The Milwaukee Socialists," p. 123; and Meta Berger, unpublished autobiography, p. 67. (Meta Berger Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin). Marc Karson's American Labor Unions and Politics (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1958) underscores the tension between Catholicism and radicalism on the national level (Chap. 9).

[68] Pienkos, "Politics, Religion, and Change in Polish Milwaukee," p. 195.

[69] Information on the Polish School Society is from the Social Democratic Herald, 29 May 1909; and the Milwaukee Leader, 23 Jan. 1913; 21 Mar. 1913; and 9 Oct. 1913.

[70] F.T.C. Minutes, 2 Oct. 1907; and the History of the Social Democratic Victories, pp. 14, 35-39.

[71] Daniel Hoan, City Government: The Record of the Milwaukee Experiment (Westport: Greenwood Press, c. 1974), p. 63.

[72] Social Democratic Herald, 25 June 1904 and 4 Sept. 1909. Mrs. C. B. Whitnall of the W.S.A., who converted from liberal to Socialist reformer, was married to one of the leading Social Democrats in Milwaukee, prominent in planning Milwaukee's modern playgrounds and parks. Because of the paucity of W.S.A. records, the earliest citation discovered on Meta Berger's official membership in the organization was in the Constitution, By-Laws, and Standing Rules of the Woman's School Alliance of Wisconsin (Milwaukee, 1911), p. 11. See, as well, her unpublished autobiography previously cited, pp. 53-59, 180. The Social Democratic position on free meals for school children is explained in Marvin Wachman, History of the Social-Democratic Party of Wisconsin, 1897-1910 (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1945), p. 81.

[73] *Social Democratic Herald*, 30 Mar. 1907.

[74] *Social Democratic Herald*, 6 Sept. 1902. Their animosity toward any appointment plan and their ambivalence on ward versus at-large elections are documented in the *Herald* on 21 Feb. 1903; 30 Mar. 1906; 6 Apr. 1907; and in a particularly heated editorial on 5 Oct. 1907.

[75] *Wisconsin Vorwarts*, 16 Apr. 1905.

[76] *Social Democratic Herald*, 13 Apr. 1907 and 21 Feb. 1903.

[77] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 17 Feb. 1901; 20 Feb. 1901; 23 Feb. 1901; 26 Feb. 1901; 10 Mar. 1901; and 30 Mar. 1901; and the *Milwaukee Daily News*, 8 Mar. 1901 and 22 Mar. 1901.

[78] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 21 Mar. and 30 Mar. 1907. The Milwaukee newspapers were filled with commentary on the proposed reorganization of the school board in March, April, and May of that year. Other useful sources include Richard Younger, "The Grand Jury That Made Milwaukee Officials Quake," *Historical Messenger* of the Milwaukee County Historical Society 11 (March 1955): 7-9; and Hoan, *City Government*, Chap. 7.

[79] *Social Democratic Herald*, 2 Nov. 1907; and Still, *Milwaukee*, p. 309.

[80] *Milwaukee School Report, 1906*, pp. 73-75; *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 4 Apr. 1906; and William Lamers, *Our Roots Grow Deep* (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools, 1974), p. 68. In reference to the upcoming bond proposal for over $300,000, the *Milwaukee Free Press* (18 Feb. 1906) noted: "There is likely to be little if any opposition on the part of the people who will pay the greater share of the taxes...There should be no division of sentiment."

[81] On the emerging alliance, see the *Social Democratic Herald*, 23 Jan. 1909; 30 Jan. 1909; 6 Feb. 1909; 13 Feb. 1909; 6 Mar. 1909; 27 Mar. 1909; 1 May 1909; and 8 May 1909; the *Milwaukee Daily News*, 24 Feb. 1909 and 26 Feb. 1909; and *The Fight for the Rights of the Public Schools in Milwaukee; Being the Report of the School Defense Committee to the Federation of Civic Societies* (Milwaukee: The Fowle Printing Co., 1909), pp. 5-24.

[82] *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, 24 Feb. 1890 and 6 Jan. 1891. On the broader social and political environment, see McKelvey, *The Quest for Quality*, Chap. 2; idem, "The Lure of the City: Rochester in the 1890s," *Rochester History* 28 (October 1966): 1-24; idem, "Turbulent but Constructive Decades in

Civic Affairs: 1867-1900," Rochester History 7 (October 1945): 1-24; and idem, "The Mayors of Rochester's Mid-Years: 1860-1900," Rochester History 28 (January 1966): 1-24.

[83] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 1 July 1895; 10 July 1895; 3 Aug. 1895; 17 Aug. 1895; 23 Nov. 1895; 17 Jan. 1896; and 25 Sept. 1897. The Democrat and Chronicle (18 Nov. 1896) also argued that the Knights of Labor properly tried to eliminate some of the class antagonisms that had surfaced among laboring groups in the city. The editor added that there was really no inherent conflict between labor and capital, and that "it is a mischievous thing for any American...to excite animosity between men whose relations are so co-extensive and mutual." On Lippelt, see the Rochester Union and Advertiser (22 Jan. 1900), who told the Labor Lyceum that "Capitalism is the era of expropriation of the property of the many by the few--socialism is the expropriation of the few for the benefit of the many."

[84] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 2 Sept. 1901; 5 Sept. 1905; and 3 Sept. 1907; and Blake McKelvey, "Organized Labor in Rochester before 1914," Rochester History 25 (January 1963): 12-24; and idem, The Quest for Quality, p. 288.

[85] Labor Journal, 27 Apr. 1906; 4 May 1906; 18 May 1906; 17 Aug. 1906; 31 Aug. 1906; 14 Sept. 1906; 28 Sept. 1906; 6 Nov. 1906; 23 Nov. 1906; 25 Oct. 1907; and 1 Nov. 1907.

[86] Labor Journal, 30 Aug. 1907.

[87] The Labor Journal (e.g. 23 Jan. 1904) discussed how the problem of political action for workers had become a subject of national debate. Details on Kovaleski are in McKelvey, "Organized Labor in Rochester," p. 23; and idem, The Quest for Quality, p. 289.

[88] The Rochester Socialist, 14 Dec. 1907.

[89] The Rochester Union and Advertiser (Feb. 18, 1908), in reference to the attack on the Italian Socialist Federation, wrote: "It is said that there are a number of anarchists in Rochester and that the police think it best to keep them in control." In addition examine the paper for 16 Mar. 1908 and 30 June 1911. The Professor in question was Kendrick Shedd, a Socialist who was deeply involved in the social center experiments in Rochester, and whose role in that aspect of educational innovation will be explored in the next chapter. On the broader national framework, see Robert J. Goldstein, "The Anarchist Scare of 1908: A Sign of Tensions in the Progressive Era," American Studies 15 (Fall 1974): 55-78.

[90] Republicans dominated the school board as they did in Toledo.

Critiques of the Republican and elite composition of the Progressive era school boards appear in the Rochester Union and Advertiser, 30 Oct. 1903; 2 Sept. 1905; and 2 Nov. 1909.

[91] The political context is well described in Blake McKelvey, "Rochester at the Turn of the Century," Rochester History 7 (January 1950): 8-12; and idem, "Rochester's Public Schools," pp. 9-13.

[92] Kansas City Star, 5 May 1891.

[93] Kansas City Star, 25 Dec. 1893; Kansas City Mail, 14 Sept. 1893; and 21 Feb. 1894. Unlike labor unions in many cities, the Industrial Council refused to give any financial aid to Coxey's army when segments of the industrial army marched through town on their way to Washington, D. C.

[94] Midland Mechanic, 13 Jan. 1898 and 17 Feb. 1898. "Labor produces all wealth and provides the luxeries of the rich," noted the Mechanic on July 14, 1898, "but it clothes itself in rags, lives in hovels, is denied justice and ridiculed by plutocracy."

[95] Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 5 Sept. 1901. The paper argued on October 2, 1903, that, "The present social system is a vast financial and economic wrong, it is organized injustice, likened unto a tree, bearing evil fruit."

[96] Kansas City Presse, 2 Nov. 1903; 24 Feb. 1904; 9 Mar. 1904; and 8 Aug. 1904; and Labor Herald, 26 Feb. 1904; 4 Mar. 1904; 25 Mar. 1904; and 8 Apr. 1904.

[97] A. Theodore Brown and Lyle W. Dorsett, K. C.: A History of Kansas City, Missouri (Boulder: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978), p. 93.

[98] Midland Mechanic, 3 Mar. 1898; 17 Mar. 1898; 25 May 1899; and 1 June 1899. On March 23, 1906, the Labor Herald reported that the major support for the Socialists in the upcoming elections would be from trade union members.

[99] Kansas City Presse, 11 Apr. 1904.

[100] Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 18 Aug. 1899; 1 Sept. 1899; 24 Nov. 1899; and 21 Dec. 1900; and Kansas City Evening Mail, 16 Feb. 1894.

[101] Labor Herald, 19 Feb. 1904.

[102] Labor Herald, 20 July 1906.

[103] Labor Herald, 8 Mar. 1912; 15 Mar. 1912; and 29 Mar. 1914. The most perplexing, unsolved problem in Kansas City politics and the schools is the relationship between the school board and the Pendergast brothers, Jim and Tom, two powerful and acknowledged city "bosses" during this era. Little mention is made of their role in the schools in contemporary literature or in the standard text by Lyle W. Dorsett, The Pendergast Machine (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968). Certainly this contrasts with the role of, say, Boss Aldridge in the Rochester schools.

[104] Labor Herald, 31 Mar. 1916.

[105] Labor Herald, 8 Mar. 1918; 29 Mar. 1918; and 5 Apr. 1918; and Kansas City and Its Schools, pp. 88-92, for an analysis of women's role in school reform in Kansas City.

"Notes to Chapter 7"

[1] Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 30 June 1910.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 20 Apr. 1906.

[4] Toledo Blade, 5 Apr. 1906.

[5] David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974). For recent restatements of his seminal work, see David B. Tyack, Michael W. Kirst, and Elizabeth Hansot, "Educational Reform in Retrospect and Prospect," Teachers College Record 81 (Spring 1980): 257-58; and Tyack and Hansot, "From Social Movement to Professional Management: An Inquiry into the Changing Character of Leadership in Public Education," American Journal of Education 88 (May 1980): 304-13.

[6] Joel H. Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), p. 90.

[7] Paul C. Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class (Chicago: McNally College Publishing Company, 1978), p. 123 and passim. Also see the various essays in Clarence J. Karier, Paul C. Violas, and Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973).

[8] Adele Marie Shaw, "Spread of Vacation Schools," World's Work 8 (October 1904): 5405. Of the extensive periodical literature, at lease examine Sadie American, "The Movement for Vacation Schools," American Journal of Sociology 4 (November 1898): 309-25; Katherine A. Jones, "Vacation Schools in the United States," Review of Reviews 17 (June 1898): 710-16; "Vacation Schools," Charities 9 (September 6, 1902): 220-24; Gertrude Blackwelder, "Chicago Vacation Schools," Elementary School Teacher 6 (December 1905): 211-14; League for Social Service, "Recreation Plus Education," Municipal Affairs 2 (September 1898): 433-48; and Richard Waterman, "Vacation Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association 37 (1898): 404-10. A good historical introduction to vacation schools is in Lawrence A. Finfer, "Leisure as Social Work in the Urban Community: The Progressive Recreation Movement, 1890-1920," Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974, Chap. 3. Certainly youth work with city children was older than the Progressive era, as Joseph F. Kett points out in Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America 1790 to the Present (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

[9] Clarence A. Perry, Wider Use of the School Plant (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910), Chap. 5.

[10] Henry S. Curtis, "Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, and Settlements," in Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1903 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), 1: 4.

[11] Helen C. Putnam, "Vacation Schools," The Forum 30 (December 1900): 492.

[12] Milwaukee Sentinel, 23 June 1902.

[13] Milwaukee Free Press, 7 July 1902 and 11 Aug. 1903. In "Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, and Settlements," Henry S. Curtis similarly argued that "The vacation schools have been experiment stations, and there has been little uniformity in the courses of study in the past." (p. 5).

[14] All of the Advocates of playgrounds, penny lunches, vacation schools, and other social service innovations assumed that the city should take over the experiments begun through private charity and philanthropy. To quote Henry S. Curtis again, in reference to playgrounds: "No small body of people can hope to secure all of the playgrounds that are needed for any good-sized city, or to maintain such a system from private funds; but they should use every means in their power to interest and educate the public so that the playgrounds may be taken over by the city and administered as a city department according to modern ideals." See Henry S. Curtis "Playground Revivals' Education to Playground Values," The Playground 5 (May 1911): 72.

[15] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 13 May 1899.

[16] Toledo Blade, 22 Oct. 1901.

[17] Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 30 June 1909. Pieplow claimed that the vacation school "combined the minimum of study with the maximum of rest and relaxation...It cares for the moral uplifting of the child, and it relieves tired, overburdened mothers."

[18] See the long editorial on the differences between liberalism and socialism in the Milwaukee Leader, 14 Oct. 1913.

[19] Francis L. Cardozo, Jr. "Vacation Schools," Education 22 (November 1901): 141.

[20] Newspaper clipping from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, ca. 1899, in Minute Book of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[21] The "rich and well to do," she wrote, "for the most part, are taken by their parents in the summer to the mountains, the seashores, into the country, and the many resorts, where they are free to enjoy an out-of-door life and gather new ideas while gaining health and vigor." She was quoted in the Toledo Blade, 30 July 1904.

[22] Carrie Westlake Whitney, Kansas City, Missouri, Its History and People, 1808-1908 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1908), 1: 629-630; and Kansas City and Its Schools (Kansas City: Prepared for the Members of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, 1917), pp. 10, 67.

[23] Toledo Blade, 30 July 1904. Bouton added, "The facts show that [the children] are usually eager to fill their places every day, and that the spirit of the work developed therein is one of both interest and enjoyment."

[24] See especially O. J. Milliken, "Chicago Vacation Schools," American Journal of Sociology 4 (November 1898): 289-308; American, "The Movement for Vacation Schools," pp. 309-25; Jones, "Vacation Schools," pp. 710-16; and the various citations in footnote 8.

[25] "Vacation Schools," Charities, p. 222.

[26] Caroline M. Hill, "The Extension of the Vacation School Idea," Elementary School Teacher 5 (January 1905): 298.

[27] Rochester School Report, 1899, p. 86. The principal added that she hoped this was the first of many vacation schools. The first one had "given a needed relief from the demoralization of the long weeks of aimless idleness so irksome to children and parents, so damaging to the young American character." (p. 88).

[28] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 7 July 1903. Also see the same paper for 6 July 1901 and 9 July 1901, as well as most July issues of local newspapers after 1899. The schools usually ran in different cities from the first or second week of July through the middle of August.

[29] Toledo Blade, 25 May 1901; 27 May 1901; 19 July 1901; 22 Oct. 1901; 10 May 1902; 14 May 1902; 17 May 1902; and 9 June 1902.

[30] *Toledo Blade*, 9 June 1902. On Steinem, examine the *Blade* for 14 May 1902; 7 Nov. 1903; 30 July 1904; 4 Apr. 1905; and 15 Apr. 1905. Also see Elaine S. Anderson, "Pauline Steinem, Dynamic Immigrant," in Marta Whitlock, ed. *Women in Ohio History* (Columbus: The Ohio Historical Society, 1976), pp. 13-19.

[31] *Kansas City and Its Schools*, pp. 10, 67; *Kansas City School Report, 1913*, p. 56; and *Kansas City School Report, 1914*, pp. 56-57.

[32] *The Milwaukee Journal*, 10 July 1899. See as well the *Milwaukee School Report, 1899*, pp. 88-89; *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board*, 1 May 1899; 6 June 1899; and 11 July 1899; *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 12 Apr. 1899; 5 June 1899; and 24 Mar. 1900; and *Milwaukee Daily News*, 11 Apr. 1900.

[33] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 24 Mar. 1900.

[34] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 8 July 1902 and 23 June 1902. On July 19, 1903, the *Milwaukee Free Press* editorialized: "The Woman's Club has the satisfaction of feeling that it has scored a veritable triumph in converting the school board to a belief in the desirability of vacation schools. None of the women who have been doing what they could to further the interests of the vacation school has doubted its salutary influence or its ultimate success since the first session showed how eagerly it was welcomed by both parents and children. Several vacation schools could have been filled as readily as one, had the funds and teachers been forthcoming. Every summer it has been necessary to turn away more pupils than could be received. It was no mean triumph to convert a man of such decided opinions as President Jeremiah Quin of the school board from his opposition to vacation schools." On Quin's shift, see the *Milwaukee School Proceedings*, 9 June 1903.

[35] Milliken, "Chicago Vacation Schools," p. 294. In reference to the New York City vacation schools, the League for Social Service, in "Recreation Plus Education," p. 438, typically argued that the creative powers of the child were drawn out through vacation school work, reducing the need for external punishments or overhead control. "The joy of creating is the joy that makes it worthwhile. The children learn to feel their ability, and in that ability comes to them the joy of their life and the glow of power."

[36] *Rochester School Report, 1899*, p. 87; and *Decennial Yearbook, Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Rochester, New York* (Rochester, 1903), p. 29 (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[37] *Toledo Blade*, 9 Oct. 1902.

[38] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 12 July 1904.

[39] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 20 Aug. 1904.

[40] The class and geographic determinants were documented in the Milwaukee Sentinel, 2 May 1900 and 8 July 1904. Rev. H. H. Jacobs, who ran a vacation school in 1904, noted that the applications of the children from Jones Island were always accepted, since they were the most needy children of the city. See Milwaukee School Proceedings, 1 Nov. 1904. On the Italian neighborhood, which was stigmatized in much of the English and also German press as a den of vice and crime, see G. LaPiana, The Italians in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Milwaukee: Prepared under the Direction of the Associated Charities, 1915).

[41] Milwaukee Sentinel, 8 July 1904; Milwaukee Daily News, 13 July 1907 and 6 July 1909.

[42] Kennon told the Rochester Union and Advertiser on October 28, 1905, that "If vacation schools are needed, the city should provide them, then they will not be provided by a society, but they will be 'our schools.'" Also see the Rochester School Report, 1907, pp. 8, and 122-23. In the next chapter, which is devoted largely to social center development, more will be said about the work of Edward J. Ward and the school extension movement in Rochester.

[43] Steinem's efforts to permit the use of public moneys for the vacation schools were traced in the Toledo Blade, 15 Apr. 1905; 20 June 1905; and 24 Jan. 1906; and in the Toledo News-Bee, 9 Dec. 1905 and 10 May 1910.

[44] Kansas City School Report, 1913, p. 56. Kansas City School Report, 1914, pp. 56-57; and Kansas City School Report, 1915, pp. 40-44; and the Milwaukee Sentinel, 2 June 1909, which reported that only three vacation schools would operate, a small fraction of the dozens of schools in the city.

[45] A study of the manual training movement in all of these cities would require a separate and detailed chapter. The sources of the movement were complex and went back at least to the 1870s, as Lawrence Cremin noted in The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962) and Berenice Fisher indicated in Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967). Many of the early advocates of manual training in these cities were not interested in vocationalism, and many of the programs initially affected every child, who took either manual training or domestic science in some form. Further study of these cities would reveal the

exact relationship of manual training to growing vocational programs in the schools. See especially, in the case of Milwaukee, Carol Judy's forthcoming dissertation in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

[46] Kansas City and Its Schools, p. 67.

[47] "The Public School System of Toledo," Commerce Club News 4 (July 28, 1919): 26.

[48] Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities (New York, Vintage Books, 1961), Part 1. On playgrounds and recreational policies in the schools, see Everett C. Preston, Principles and Statutory Provisions Relating to Recreational, Medical, and Social Welfare Services of the Public Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935).

[49] Curtis, "Vacation Schools, Playgrounds, and Settlements," p. 3.

[50] Henry S. Curtis, "The Playground Movement of Today," Proceedings of the Fifty-Seventh Annual Session of the Wisconsin Teachers' Association (Madison: Democrat Printing Company, State Printer, 1910), p. 167. A similar argument was made in Perry, Wider Use, pp. 168-70. Standard interpretations on the playground movement include Clarence E. Rainwater, The Play Movement in the United States (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1922); Henry S. Curtis, The Practical Conduct of Play (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915); idem, Education Through Play (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916); and idem, The Play Movement and Its Significance (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917).

[51] Pertinent sources on local organizations include the following: Samuel M. Jones, Third Annual Message of Samuel M. Jones, Mayor (Toledo, 1899), pp. 24-25; Toledo Blade, 23 June 1899 and 6 July 1899; The Children's Playground League, 1903 (Rochester, 1903); Milwaukee Daily News 14 Mar. 1903 and 22 Apr. 1903; Milwaukee Sentinel, 22 Apr. 1903; and Second Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare (Kansas City: Board of Public Welfare, 1911), p. 51. Rochester's playground movement has been especially well documented compared to these other cities. See, for example, Blake McKelvey, "Rochester Learns to Play: 1850-1900," Rochester History 8 (July 1946): 1-24; idem, "An Historical View of Rochester's Parks and Playgrounds," Rochester History 9 (January 1949): 1-24; William F. Peck, History of Rochester and Monroe County, New York (New York: The Pioneer Publishing Company, 1908), p. 233; and Edward W. Stevens, Jr., "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1917: An Historical Perspective on Social Control in Public Education," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester,

1971, pp. 245-46.

[52] "Women in the Recreation Movement," The Playground 11 (July 1917): 203-04. Reports of the General Federation of Women's Clubs for the Progressive era, while too voluminous to cite here, are filled with examples of how local groups of women helped inaugurate the playground movement.

[53] Undated newspaper clipping, ca. 1899, Minute Book, 1896-1901, Women's Education and Industrial Union (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[54] Toledo Blade, 9 Oct. 1895.

[55] Milwaukee Sentinel, 26 Nov. 1898; 25 Feb. 1899; 22 Sept. 1899; 20 Oct. 1899; 12 Jan. 1906; 21 Jan. 1906; 29 Sept. 1906; 7 Mar. 1908; Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 8 May 1908; Milwaukee Daily News, 5 July 1902; 5 Oct. 1904; 15 Apr. 1905; 10 Jan. 1906; and Social Democratic Herald, 22 Feb. 1902; 19 July 1902; 12 Mar. 1904; and 27 Mar. 1909.

[56] Whitney, Kansas City, Missouri, 1: 629-630.

[57] Labor Journal, 22 Feb. 1907. The Journal gave wide coverage to the work of the Children's Playground League. Also idem, 29 Mar. 1907; The Children's Playground League of Rochester, 1903, p. 1; The Children's Playground League, 1908 (Rochester, 1908), p. 2; Proceedings of the Second Annual Playground Congress and Yearbook, 1908 (New York City: Published by the Playground Association of America, 1909), p. 365; and "The Yearbook of the Playground and Recreation Association of America," reprinted in The Playground 7 (January 1914): 399.

[58] The Toledo Union, 31 July 1897; Toledo Saturday Night, 6 May 1899 and 1 July 1899; and Toledo Union Leader, 1 May 1908 and 13 May 1910. The Toledo Union above claimed that "Golden Rule Park is a garden of Eden with a few trees, flower-pots, and a velvety carpet of grass. There are many spots on earth more beautiful to look upon, but none where the spirit of kindly fellowship is so manifest."

[59] Quoted in the Labor Herald, 24 Jan. 1908.

[60] Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 7 June 1907 and 29 Apr. 1910.

[61] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 6 Nov. 1899 and 24 Mar. 1902; and Edward J. Ward, The Social Center (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913), pp. 179-80.

[62] Labor Herald, 19 Feb. 1904.

[63] Social Democratic Herald, 22 Feb. 1902; 19 July 1902; 12 Mar. 1904; 3 Feb. 1906; and 5 Nov. 1910.

[64] See especially Dorothy C. Enderis to Emil Seidel, January 24, 1944 (Seidel Papers), on the former mayor's influence. A typical cartoon appeared in the Milwaukee Leader on 6 Apr. 1914.

[65] Newspaper clipping, ca. 1900, Minute Book, 1896-1901 of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[66] The Children's Playground League, 1903, p. 3; and McKelvey, "An Historical View," pp. 15-16.

[67] Toledo Blade, 6 July 1899.

[68] Toledo Blade, 27 July 1899; 7 Aug. 1899; 11 Sept. 1899; and 21 Nov. 1899.

[69] Milwaukee Daily News, 1 Aug. 1905; Milwaukee Free Press, 7 July 1906; and Milwaukee Sentinel, 2 Dec. 1903. When the first public supervised playground was opened in 1905, the News (cited above) stated that "The parents and children of the neighborhood are delighted with the new playground and have been interested spectators of the improvements there."

[70] Milwaukee Free Press, 7 July 1906.

[71] Examples include Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, pp. 66-69; Dominick Joseph Cavallo, "The Child in American Reform: A Psychohistory of the Movement to Organize Children's Play," Ph.D. dissertation, S.U.N.Y.-Stoney Brook, 1976; and Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chap. 4. Joseph Ketts' examination of playgrounds also deals more with the aspirations of reformers than the social outcome of recreational reform. See Rites of Passage, pp. 224-27.

[72] David Blaustein, "The Schoolhouse Recreation Center As an Attempt To Aid Immigrants in Adjusting Themselves to American Conditions," The Playground 6 (December 1912): 330. Another writer argued that "The playground deals with race cleavage by Americanizing immigrants." See Dorothy Becker, "Social Cleavage and the Playground," The Playground 9 (June 1915): 87. In addition to the literature cited in the previous footnote, also examine Finfer, "Leisure as Social Work."

445

[73] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 21 Dec. 1908.

[74] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 23 Nov. 1908. Also see in the same newspaper 10 Mar. 1908; 14 Apr. 1908; and the letter to the editor, 3 Aug. 1911, where one angry resident stated that "Whole neighborhoods are annoyed by children with their noisy plays and tricks in the streets. Nothing escapes them, they care for nothing, neither do their parents." This "Taxpayer" wondered why anyone paid for playgrounds through their taxes.

[75] Quoted in the Toledo News-Bee, 18 Oct. 1898, the Democratic rival and warm supporter of playgrounds. Contrary to the Blade, this paper believed that "There ought to be a playground for boys and girls at every school house."

[76] Toledo News-Bee, 18 Sept. 1906; and the Toledo Blade, 18 Sept. 1906.

[77] Allegations of vice, immorality, and urban disorder at the social centers, recreation centers, and playgrounds in the Milwaukee Sentinel, 19 Oct. 1911; 3 Oct. 1913; and 5 Jan. 1914; and in the Milwaukee School Proceedings, 3 Sept. 1912; 5 Aug. 1913; 2 Sept. 1913; 6 Oct. 1914; 3 Dec. 1914; 4 May 1915; and 1 June 1915.

[78] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 15 Oct. 1903, in a description of speeches at the annual meeting of the organization.

[79] Toledo Blade, 19 Oct. 1899.

[80] Quoted in Finfer, "Leisure as Social Work," pp. 141-42, on the effects of the vacation and playground movements in one particular city.

[81] Toledo Blade, 9 Oct. 1902.

[82] Rowland Haynes, "Recreation Survey, Milwaukee, Wisconsin," The Playground 6 (1912), p. 44; and Milwaukee City Club, Amusements and Recreation in Milwaukee (Milwaukee: City Club of Milwaukee, 1914).

[83] Amusements and Recreation in Milwaukee, p. 37.

[84] Ibid., p. 10.

[85] Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare of Kansas City, Missouri (Kansas City, 1913), p. 57.

[86] Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare, pp. 49-77; and Third Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare of Kansas City, Missouri (Kansas City, 1912), pp. 244-45.

"Notes to Chapter 8"

[1] George B. Ford, "Madison Conference on Social Centers," Survey 27 (November 18, 1911): 1229. On regional and national meetings, see Charles W. Holman, "Focusing Social Forces in the Southwest," Survey 26 (September 23, 1911): 866-68; "The Social Center--Center of Democracy," Survey 30 (September 6, 1913): 675-76; and "Echoes from the First National Conference of Social Centers," The Common Good 5 (December 1911): 21-27.

[2] Ford, "Madison Conference," p. 1231. The song is conveniently reprinted in Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p. 258.

[3] See, for example, John Dewey, "The School as a Center of Social Life," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1902): 373-83; Charles W. Eliot, "The Full Utilization of a Public School Plant," Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1903): 241-47. Several useful reports by Clarence A. Perry include the following: The Extension of Public Education (Washington, D.C.: Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Education, 1915); School Extension Statistics (Washington, D.C.: Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Education, 1917); and Social Center Gazette, 1919-1920 (New York City: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1920). Also examine Henry E. Jackson, The Community Center (Washington, D.C.: Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Education, 1918); and Eleanor T. Glueck, Extended Use of School Buildings (Washington, D.C.: Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Education, 1927).

[4] Edward J. Ward described the multiple explanations in "School Extension," The Common Good (January 1911): 12-16. This magazine was Rochester's main social welfare journal in the Progressive era.

[5] Edward J. Ward, "Rochester Social Centers," Proceedings of the Third Annual Playground Congress and Yearbook 3 (1909): 387-88.

[6] Edward J. Ward, "The Little Red Schoolhouse," Survey 22 (August 7, 1909): 640; and in his edited volume, The Social Center (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913), pp. 38-39, where he admitted that the rural analogy was overdrawn. Also see the opinion of Detroit's school superintendent, W. C. Martindale, "The School as a Social Center and Its Relation to Evening Recreation Centers and Other Activities," The Playground 6 (September 1912): 193.

[7] Lee F. Hanmer, "The Wider Use of the School Plant," Ameri-

can Education 15 (March 1912): 305.

[8] *Independent* 54 (March 6, 1902): 583-84. The editor still acknowledged other historical precedents for the evolution of the modern center. For Woodrow Wilson's views, see "The Need of Citizenship Organization," *American City* 5 (November 1911): 265-68.

[9] Mary Josephine Mayer, "Our Public Schools as Social Centers," *American Review of Reviews* 44 (August 1911): 201.

[10] *Milwaukee School Report*, 1867, p. 78.

[11] *Toledo Board of Education Minutes*, 30 July 1860; 25 Feb. 1864; 17 June 1864; 26 Nov. 1864; 28 Jan. 1865; 26 June 1869; 1 June 1871; and 18 June 1871.

[12] A. Laura McGregor, "The Early History of the Rochester Public Schools, 1813-1850," *Rochester Historical Society Publications* (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939), pp. 51-52. Also see Blake McKelvey, *Rochester: The Water-Power City 1812-1854* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945), pp. 266-67.

[13] Clarence A. Perry, *Wider Use of the School Plant* (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910), p. 3.

[14] *Rochester School Report, 1907*, p. 129. On the importance of parent organizations, see Howard Woolston, "Social Education in the Public Schools," *Charities and the Commons* 16 (September 1, 1906): 574; and Eleanor Touroff Glueck, *The Community Use of Schools* (Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1927), who asserted that "The National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers Associations is by far the most important and far-reaching of the private organizations in their influence upon the establishment of a closer relationship between the school and the neighborhood." Parents have been a much-neglected source of historiographical interest in the Progressive era, which is unusual since organized parents at least left considerable printed records. The first important scholarly examination of organized parents was by Steven L. Schlossman, "Before Home Start: Notes Toward a History of Parent Education in America, 1897-1929," *Harvard Educational Review* 46 (1976): 436-67. From a different perspective consult William J. Reese, "Between Home and School: Organized Parents, Clubwomen, and Urban Education in the Progressive Era," *School Review* 87 (November 1978): 3-28.

[15] Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School*, p. 272; and Schlossman, "Before Home Start."

[16] Nathaniel Butler, "Work of the Associations," *School Review* 16 (Fall 1908): 78.

[17] Mary Ritter Beard, *Women's Work in Municipalities* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1915), p. 39.

[18] *Yearbook of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, Rochester, New York* (Rochester: H. D. Bryan, Printer, 1897), p. 4 (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[19] Ibid., p. 12. Montgomery was active in the local mothers' unions as indicated by the *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, 6 Apr. 1898; and by the *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, 5 June 1901.

[20] *Toledo News-Bee*, 11 Nov. 1904.

[21] *Proceedings of the Second Annual Convention of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Clubs* (1898), p. 23. Also see the *Milwaukee Sentinel* on October 1, 1898, where a prominent W.S.A. official outlined the aim of "bringing into closer contact the school teacher and the home teacher or the teacher and the parent."

[22] See especially Wayne Urban, "Organized Teachers and Educational Reform during the Progressive Era: 1890-1920," *History of Education Quarterly* 16 (Spring 1976): 35-52. For contemporary sources, consult Charles N. Chadwick, "Parents and the Public Schools," *Outlook* 60 (October 8, 1898): 387; E. W. Griffith, "How to Secure the Cooperation of the Home," *American Education* 11 (December 1907): 186; Sarah E. Griswold, "The Rise of the P.T.A. The Purpose and Spirit of Parent-Teacher Associations," *School and Home Education* 34 (April 1915): 302; and Agnes Daley, "Parents' Meetings in the New York Schools," *Journal of Home Economics* 12 (November 1920): 496-97.

[23] *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, 28 Oct. 1896.

[24] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, 12 June 1901. Brooks' activities can be traced in idem, 6 June 1900; 11 June 1901; 5 Mar. 1902; and 5 Oct. 1905. Mrs. Brooks was made an honorary member of every mothers' club in the city.

[25] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, 2 June 1905.

[26] *Toledo Evening Bee*, 11 Sept. 1898. Unlike the Republican *Blade*, the *Bee* was a consistent champion of parental organizations, as reflected in its arguments in many different articles

and editorials on education. See especially 10 Sept. 1898; 29 Dec. 1898; 1 Oct. 1899; 10 Jan. 1901; and 18 Nov. 1901. In the last citation, the newspaper editorialized that "There ought to be a parents' association in connection with every school building, and a parents' committee that would regularly inspect the building, the sanitary arrangements, etc., and also look into the rules and regulations."

[27] Toledo Blade, 14 Oct. 1899.

[28] Toledo Blade, 3 Jan. 1905. Steinem's activism with parents can be easily documented in idem, 3 Jan. 1905; 5 Jan. 1905; 19 Jan. 1905; 7 Oct. 1905; 10 Oct. 1905; and 14 Nov. 1906; Toledo News-Bee, 2 Feb. 1905; 5 Apr. 1905; and 5 Oct. 1905.

[29] Toledo News-Bee, 15 Nov. 1910. The principal added: "When we have perfect understanding between parents and teachers we will have almost reached the millenium in education."

[30] Toledo Blade, 4 Apr. 1912.

[31] Milwaukee Sentinel, 22 Jan. 1897. The Germania Und Abend-Post noted on January 14, 1900, that numerous parental associations were now found in Milwaukee, many of which actively meddled in school affairs.

[32] Kansas City Daily Journal, 8 Mar. 1901.

[33] Kansas City School Report, 1903, p. 90. Kansas City's kindergarten teachers were active in the formation of mothers' unions starting in the Nineties. See, for example, idem, p. 189; Kansas City School Report, 1911, p. 65; as well as Kansas City School Report, 1913, pp. 52, 95.

[34] For some of the many examples, see the Toledo News-Bee, 9 Oct. 1912; 7 Jan. 1913; 18 Mar. 1913; and 22 Sept. 1914; Toledo Blade, 4 Feb. 1913; 18 Nov. 1913; and 6 Oct. 1914 ("Parents Besiege the School Board"). On August 20, 1914, the Blade noted, "Delegations of citizens frequently appear before the board of education urging the need of suitable school accommodations, needs which the board realize should be met, but which the lack of a building fund makes it impossible to meet."

[35] Toledo Blade, 18 Nov. 1913. Ironville parents lobbied for electric lighting for, as their delegation to the school board explained, "when the parents held meetings in the building at night...they had to carry oil lamps to the school."

[36] Rochester School Report, 1904, p. 34. The schools, he

added, were used "for exhibits of the work of pupils and as gathering places for the patrons of the schools."

[37] Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, p. 257.

[38] Milwaukee School Report, 1909. Although her scholarship is thoroughly uncritical of her subject, see Louise W. Sears' biography of Pearse, Life and Times of a Midwest Educator (Lincoln, Nebraska: The State Journal Printing Company, 1944).

[39] "Social Center Work in Wisconsin," The Playground 4 (September 1910): 220; and Clarence A. Perry, "The School as a Factor in Neighborhood Development," Proceedings of the National Conferences on Charities and Correction (1914): 389. In addition to the previously cited literature on the social centers, also see William J. Reese, "The Social Center Movement and Progressive Reform," in The Community Study of Urban Educational History, ed. Diane Ravitch and Ronald Goodenow (New York: Teachers College Press, forthcoming.)

[40] Blake McKelvey, Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 137. Also see idem, "Historic Origins of Rochester's Social Welfare Agencies," Rochester History 9 (April 1947): 32-33; and "Rochester's Public Schools: A Testing Ground for Community Policies," Rochester History 31 (April 1969): 12-13.

[41] Rochester School Report, 1910, p. 10. President George Forbes, a Good Government leader, also wrote an important essay entitled, "Buttressing the Foundations of Democracy," Survey 27 (November 18, 1911): 1231-35.

[42] Ward, The Social Center, pp. 179-80; McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, p. 95; and Edward W. Stevens, Jr., "Social Centers, Politics, and Social Efficiency in the Progressive Era," History of Education Quarterly 12 (Spring 1972): 25-26.

[43] Labor Journal, 22 Feb. 1907. As it related on March 29, 1907, "The People of Rochester want public playgrounds and they also wish places where they may assemble and discuss public topics."

[44] A good overview of the administrative and curricular changes of these years is available in Herbert S. Weet, "The Development of Public Education in Rochester, 1900-1910," Publications of the Rochester Historical Society 17 (Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939): 183-232. For a very different perspective, consult the more critical and valuable study by Edward W. Stevens, "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1917: An Historical Perspective on Social

Control in Public Education," Ed.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971.

[45] Joel H. Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), p. 83.

[46] Stevens, "Social Centers, Politics, and Social Efficiency," pp. 16-33.

[47] Eliot, "The Full Utilization of a Public School Plant," p. 241.

[48] Sylvester Baxter, "Widening the Use of the Public School-House," World's Work 5 (March 1903): 3247.

[49] T. Aaron Levy, "Extended Use of the Public Schools," American Education 8 (December 1904): 207.

[50] Clarence A. Perry, "Summer Use of the School-House," American City 2 (June 1910): 265. Also see Lewis B. Avery, "The Wider Use of the School Plant," School and Society 7 (April 27, 1918): 481-85; and Gary, Indiana's famous school superintendent, William A. Wirt, "Getting the Maximum Use of Our School Facilities," American City 18 (March 1918): 219-22.

[51] J. G. Stokes, "Public Schools as Social Centers," Annals of the American Academy 23 (May 1904): 461; and Mary E. McDowell, "Chicago's Schools Closed to Discussion," The Common Good 5 (December 1911): 24-25.

[52] William H. Maxwell, "The Economic Use of School Buildings," Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1910): 326.

[53] Edward J. Ward, "Where Suffragists and Anti's Unite," American City 10 (June 1914): 524. His common use of family and home metaphors is seen in "Community Cooperation in Education," Child-Welfare Magazine 8 (August 1914): 494-96. Also see Harriet L. Childs, "The Rochester Social Centers," American City 5 (July 1911): 18-27. In "The Rochester Social Centers," p. 387, Ward wrote: "The idea of the public school plant being used as the social center of any community is so obvious and there are so many lines of arguments in its favor that one may choose a different line for almost any type of audience."

[54] Ward, The Social Center, p. 111.

[55] Ward, "Community Cooperation in Education," p. 494. Details of Ward's life are drawn from Ray Stannard Baker, "Do It

For Rochester," American Magazine 70 (September 1910): 683-696; Who Was Who in America (Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Company, 1950), Vol. 2, p. 556; and from his own numerous writings.

[56] Ibid.; and Ward, The Social Center, p. 141. His book is filled with slurs on the arrogance of private monopolies and the commercialization of American life.

[57] Rochester Annual Report, 1907, p. 124.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ward, "The Little Red Schoolhouse," p. 642. Ward's reports to the Rochester school board between 1907 and 1910 reflect this same sentiment.

[60] Ibid. These themes were common in Ward's writings. See, for example, The Social Center, Chap. 8.

[61] Lawrence A. Finfer, "Leisure As Social Work in the Urban Community: The Progressive Recreation Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974, pp. 241-42.

[62] Edward J. Ward, "The Rochester Movement," Independent 67 (October 14, 1909): 860.

[63] Weet, "The Development of Public Education in Rochester," pp. 204-05. For an opposing viewpoint, see Ward's many comments on the importance of free discussion and civic club autonomy.

[64] Edward J. Ward, "The Schoolhouse as the Civic and Social Center of the Community," Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1912): 447. Also see The Social Center, Chap. 2.

[65] The history of the growth of the Rochester movement is detailed in several places. Besides the secondary literature previously cited, peruse Ward's many descriptions of the movement, "The Rochester Movement," pp. 860-61; "The Rochester Social Centers and Civic Clubs Movement," American School Board Journal 40 (February 1910): 4-5; Rochester Social Centers and Civic Clubs: Story of the First Two Years (Rochester: Published by the League of Civic Clubs, 1909); and the editorial, "Clubbed Into Democracy," The Common Good 4 (February 1911): 3-4.

[66] Rochester Social Centers and Civic Clubs, picture opposite page 103. Among the officers of the Men's Civic Club at the No. 14 school were "a well-to-do physician, a journeyman printer, a banker and a labor leader. The officers of one of the women's

civic clubs are a negress, two Jewesses, two Catholics, a Unitarian, and a Presbyterian." Quoted in Ward, "The Rochester Movement," p. 860.

[67] Ward reiterated in "The Rochester Social Center and Civic Club Movement," that the search for the common good required what he called "all inclusive" membership: "Our ideal is not the spirit of the Social Settlement, but of the little red schoolhouse where folks got together, not as any particular sort of folks, but just as folks." (p. 4).

[68] For a flavor of press opposition, see the following citations, usually for the editorial page: Rochester Post Express 30 Nov. 1909; 8 Dec. 1909; 2 Feb. 1910; the Rochester Times, 17 Dec. 1908; 12 Dec. 1909; 14 Dec. 1909; 16 Dec. 1909; 18 Dec. 1909; 2 Feb. 1910; and the Rochester Union and Advertiser, 1 Feb. 1910.

[69] Shedd's background is described in Stevens, "Social Centers, Politics, and Social Efficiency," pp. 28-29. Newspaper writers and others frequently reminded Shedd of his earlier speech before the Labor Lyceum, reprinted in the Rochester Union and Advertiser, 26 Nov. 1906. Shedd claimed that anarchists were Socialists "gone to seed." And both groups, he claimed, were pessimists and "muckrakers and are continually on the hunt for the filth and worms, the evils and shadows, the bitterness and badness of the world." For his arrest and dismissal from the university, see idem, 30 June 1911 and 13 Feb. 1912.

[70] Rochester Times, 14 Dec. 1909; 16 Dec. 1909; Rochester Post Express, 29 Dec. 1909; and Rochester Union and Advertiser, 10 Mar. 1909.

[71] Rev. A. M. O'Neill's commentary on the centers is in the Rochester Times, 29 Nov. 1909. The Rochester Post Express support for O'Neill's stand can be found on December 29, 1909. Ward's rebuttal was reprinted in several places, including the Rochester Union and Advertiser, 1 Feb. 1910.

[72] Rochester Herald, 30 Nov. 1909.

[73] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 3 Feb. 1910.

[74] Rochester Post Express, 1 Feb. 1910.

[75] This occurred with the second controversy with Professor Shedd; for an earlier defense of free speech, see the Rochester Times, 18 Dec. 1909.

[76] The Rochester newspapers were filled with editorials and

comment on the activities of these organizations in February of 1910. For a listing of these groups and proof of their long support for the centers, see the Rochester Times and the Rochester Post Express, 4 Feb. 1910.

[77] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 25 June 1910. Many grass-roots supporters honored him at a summer farewell party before he left for his new job in Madison, Wisconsin.

[78] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 9 Feb. 1911.

[79] McKelvey, The Quest for Quality, p. 106; as well as the numerous newspaper citations for early February, 1910. On Shedd's dismissal, see footnote 69.

[80] Edward J. Ward, "There Are Other Rochesters," The Common Good 7 (April 1914): 101.

[81] Social Democratic Herald, 7 May 1910; 23 July 1910; and 29 Oct. 1910; and History of the Social Democratic Victories (Milwaukee: Social Democratic Publishing Co., 1911), pp. 51-52.

[82] Toledo Evening Bee, 25 Oct. 1898; 11 Nov. 1898; and 2 Apr. 1910. These women were active in many social welfare organizations and women's clubs that endorsed the community use of the schools and other social services. In the November citation listed above, Mary Law told the City Federation of Women's Clubs: "Every school in the city should be the center of the literary and moral life of its immediate neighborhood. There should be lectures and evening entertainments to which parents might go with their children and thus unify the interests of parents, pupils, and teachers. The school buildings are owned by the people and should be utilized for public meetings of an educational character."

[83] Toledo Evening Bee, 28 Sept. 1898. This position was reiterated on 29 Sept. 1898; 21 Jan. 1901; 28 Feb. 1901; 12 Jan. 1902; and in the Toledo News-Bee, 16 Nov. 1904. In the latter editorial, it was asserted that "The public school buildings belong to the people. They are paid for with money taken from the people by taxation."

[84] Toledo Evening Bee, 7 Jan. 1900; 14 Jan. 1900; 17 Jan. 1900; Toledo Blade, 8 Jan. 1900; 19 Jan. 1900; 22 Jan. 1900; and 29 Jan. 1900.

[85] Toledo Evening Bee, 21 Jan. 1901. Earlier idem, 14 Jan. 1900 and 22 Jan. 1900, where the editor wrote: "It is difficult to recall any venture in the history of Toledo that

has met with such tremendous success as has the Complete Education League's scheme of giving free concerts every Saturday night throughout the winter."

[86] Toledo Evening Bee, 23 Jan. 1900; 7 Apr. 1900; 13 Apr. 1900; and Toledo Blade, 12 Feb. 1900 and 5 May 1900.

[87] Toledo Blade, 10 Aug. 1902. While the running quarrels can be sketched from the Toledo Board of Education Minutes (1899-1903, at the Center for Archival Research), they are more accessible in the Toledo Evening Bee, 23 Nov. 1899; 7 Jan. 1900; 17 Jan. 1900; 28 Feb. 1900; 29 Mar. 1900; 17 Apr. 1900; 13 Feb. 1901; and 19 Nov. 1901 ("Golden Rule Movement is Tramped Upon").

[88] Toledo News-Bee, 16 Nov. 1904.

[89] Guitteau's life is evaluated in William J. Reese, "William Backus Guitteau and Educational Reform in Toledo During the Progressive Era," M.A. thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1975. On Guitteau's activism with teachers, see the Toledo Evening Bee, 23 Mar. 1900. Guitteau rose from the ranks from high school teacher to principal to superintendent.

[90] The ramifications of the Smith Law were widespread and the subject of considerable newspaper coverage in the Toledo Blade, 23 May 1911; 19 July 1911; 7 Feb. 1913; 15 Feb. 1913; 17 Apr. 1913; and Toledo News-Bee, 3 June 1912; 8 July 1913; 16 Feb. 1914; 17 Feb. 1914; 18 Feb. 1914; and 16 June 1914. The last article cited indicated that the Toledo Real Estate Board stood firmly behind the law as a way to protect property.

[91] Toledo Blade, 4 Apr. 1912; 7 May 1912; 12 Oct. 1912; 26 Nov. 1913; and Toledo News-Bee, 18 Mar. 1913; 24 Nov. 1913; and 26 Nov. 1913.

[92] Although Milwaukee has some excellent standard histories, like Bayrd Still's Milwaukee: The History of a City (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948), it lacks a strong interpretive history of the schools. One useful starting point is William Lamers, Our Roots Grow Deep (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools, 1974). Also see William J. Reese, "'Partisans of the Proletariat': The Socialist Working Class and the Milwaukee Schools, 1890-1920," History of Education Quarterly, forthcoming.

[93] Social Democratic Herald, 17 May 1902.

[94] Milwaukee Leader, 3 June 1914; and Milwaukee Free Press, 1 Apr. 1912. For the background of Wisconsin and Milwaukee social center policy, examine "Social Center Work in Wisconsin,"

The Playground 4 (September 1910): 219-220; and "Social Centers in Milwaukee," *Survey* 28 (May 18, 1912): 298-99.

[95] *Milwaukee Leader*, 3 June 1914. "The school buildings," she added, "that cost the people so much money ought to be given to them to discuss any subject they please."

[96] *Milwaukee Leader*, 15 Jan. 1916. The Social Democrats had endorsed the free and unlimited use of the neighborhood schools by the community since the turn of the century, when it became a prominent part of their municipal platform. A small sampling of their support can be gleaned from the *Social Democratic Herald*, 22 Feb. 1902; 26 Apr. 1902; 17 May 1902; 7 Feb. 1903; 12 Mar. 1904; 10 Sept. 1904; 3 Feb. 1906; 23 Oct. 1909; 7 May 1910; 28 May 1910; and the *Milwaukee Leader*, 8 Feb. 1912; 16 Mar. 1912; 22 Mar. 1912; 5 Oct. 1912; 14 Oct. 1913; and 3 Nov. 1913 ("School Center Is Again Given Strong Impetus").

[97] Though precise documentation is from the *Milwaukee School Proceedings* and the *Annual Reports*, a useful and more easily accessible sketch of the local movement is in "Social Center Work in Milwaukee," *Charities and the Commons* 21 (December 19, 1909): 441-42. On the Federation of Civic Societies, see the *Proceedings*, 5 Jan. 1909.

[98] "Recreation Centers," *The Playground* 6 (April 1912): 26.

[99] Harold O. Berg was quoted in Herman B. Dine, "The Social Center and the Immigrant," *The Playground* 9 (February 1917): 459. Also see Berg, "Staying After School," *Survey* 37 (December 16, 1916): 298-300, who explained how closely many activities were supervised at the local centers. Also see "Milwaukee's Recreation Movement," *Survey* 25 (February 18, 1911): 832-33; Duane Mowry, "Social and Recreational Activity in Milwaukee," *American City* 6 (May 1912): 748-50; and idem, "Use of School Buildings for Other Than School Purposes," *Education* 29 (October 1908): 92-96.

[100] *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board*, 30 June 1909.

[101] *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board*, 30 June 1911. Puelicher had made the same point earlier in idem, 8 May 1908.

[102] On the Russian Self Education Club, consult the *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board* 7 Dec. 1909; on other groups, see *Milwaukee Leader*, 25 Apr. 1913.

[103] *Milwaukee Free Press*, 7 Mar. 1909. For more details on

community activities and neighborhood use at this particular school, see the *Milwaukee Daily News*, 16 Jan. 1908; 11 Feb. 1908; 22 Feb. 1908; 27 Feb. 1908; 13 Mar. 1908; and *Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board*, 2 June 1908; 30 June 1908; and 1 Sept. 1908.

[104] *Milwaukee Free Press*, 16 Nov. 1913.

[105] Berg, "Staying After School," p. 300.

[106] *Milwaukee Leader*, 16 Apr. 1915.

[107] Berg, "Staying After School," p. 298. On the popularity of Milwaukee's social centers, see Berg's "Public Schools as Municipal Neighborhood Recreation Centers," *American City* 16 (January 1917): 40, where he stated: "Our school halls, having a seating capacity of from four to eleven hundred, are taxed nearly to their fullest capacity and often people must be turned away."

[108] *Milwaukee School Report, 1906*, p. 76.

[109] Glueck, *The Community Use of Schools*, pp. 18-26.

[110] *The Social Center in Kansas City, Missouri* (Kansas City: Research Bureau of the Board of Public Welfare, 1913), pp. 3-8.

[111] *Kansas City School Report, 1904*, p. 107. In an earlier publication, *Kansas City School Report, 1902*, Greenwood noted that local landscape architects wanted to make improvements in school structures so that "The school would thus become a social center in each district, radiating its influence out to each home, carried there [to the parents] by the children."

[112] *Labor Herald*, 1 Dec. 1911.

[113] The best local publications on the social centers are the previously cited *The Social Center in Kansas City, Missouri*; *Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare* (Kansas City, 1913), p. 41; and *Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Public Welfare* (Kansas City, 1915), pp. 23-30.

[114] Ibid.

"Notes to Chapter 9"

[1] Milwaukee Leader, 6 Mar. 1915.

[2] See the selections on Horace Mann's educational beliefs in Lawrence A. Cremin, ed. The Republic and the School (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957); and concerns over children's health and infant schools in Carl F. Kaestle and Maris A. Vinovskis, Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), Chap. 3.

[3] More documentation is listed later in the chapter, but examine "Facts About Vaccination," Independent 63 (September 12, 1907): 642. "In spite of...evidence of the protective power of vaccination, and in spite of the almost universal consensus of trained medical workers and thinkers, there are a number of people who refuse to believe in the efficacy of vaccination."

[4] C.E.A. Winslow, "Poverty as a Factor in Disease," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work (1919): 154.

[5] Ernest Bryant Hoag and Lewis M. Terman, Health Work in the Schools (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), p. 4. Terman authored the chapter from which this quote was selected.

[6] See Luther Halsey Gulick and Leonard P. Ayres, Medical Inspection of Schools (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1908), p. 202; and Edward F. Brown, "A Firmer Physical Foundation for Education," School and Society 2 (October 9, 1915): 505.

[7] Louis B. Blan, "Are We Taking Proper Care of the Health of Our Children?" Pedagogical Seminary 13 (1912): 220. Also see H. M. Bracken, "Health Administration of Schools," Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1914): 677. "The proper health administration of schools is a most important economic problem from every point of view. The annual economic loss in the United States from preventable diseases is estimated at $1,500,000,000." Other writers argued that children who were healthy would not fail promotion, and that would presumably save taxpayers from paying for their education for that extra year.

[8] Quoted in John Spargo, Underfed School Children (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1906), p. 5.

[9] J. Kent, "Shall the State Maintain Its Children," Justice 26 (1899): 4.

[10] "Free Maintenance," *Justice* 8 (1891): 1; '*After Bread, Education': A Plan for the State Feeding of School Children* (London: The Fabian Society, 1905); and Brian Simon, *Education and the Labor Movement, 1870-1920* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1965). The Fabians, of course, were nonproletarians who shared the efficiency and imperialist aims of the Liberals. For a revisionist view, consult E. J. Hobsbawm, *Laboring Men* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964), Chap. 14.

[11] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, 20 Oct. 1902.

[12] *Rochester Socialist*, 1 Jan. 1908.

[13] *The Toledo Union*, 13 Nov. 1897.

[14] *The Socialist*, 12 Aug. 1905; and 7 Oct. 1905.

[15] *Toledo Evening Bee*, 16 Oct. 1909.

[16] *Social Democratic Herald*, 25 Sept. 1909.

[17] F.T.C. *Minutes*, 4 Aug. 1909. Socialist support for state aid for school meals is documented in the *Social Democratic Herald*, 15 Feb. 1902; 12 May 1906; 17 Apr. 1909; 29 May 1909; 7 Aug. 1909; 25 Sept. 1909; 2 Oct. 1909; 28 Jan. 1911; 11 Mar. 1911; *Milwaukee Leader*, 15 Mar. 1913; 22 Mar. 1913; 5 Mar. 1915; 30 Mar. 1915; and 30 Mar. 1917; and Meta Berger, unpublished autobiography, p. 54.

[18] *People's Advocate*, 10 Apr. 1902.

[19] *Labor Herald*, 5 Feb. 1904.

[20] *Missouri Staats-Zeitung*, 21 May 1909.

[21] Robert Hunter, *Poverty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965 reprint), p. 191. His position was reiterated in "The Social Significance of Underfed Children," *International Quarterly* 12 (June 1906): 342.

[22] John Spargo, *The Bitter Cry of the Children* (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1968 reprint), p. 58; and idem, "Underfed Children in Our Public Schools," *Independent* 58 (May 11, 1905): 1060-63.

[23] "The Feeding of School Children," *Justice* 23 (1906): 4; Sir Arthur Clay, "School Feeding Question in England," *Charities*

and the Commons 17 (January 17, 1907): 699-707; "School Fed Childhood," *The Spectator* 99 (October 19, 1907): 560-61; and Henry Iselin, "The Feeding of Elementary School Children," *Economic Review* 21 (April 1911): 202-06.

[24] Simon, *Education and the Labour Movement*, Chap. 8.

[25] Ibid. Gorst nevertheless had a reputation as "the children's representative in Parliament," as demonstrated by Samuel A. Barnett, "Free Meals for Underfed Children," *Independent Review* 6 (June 1905): 158. The climate of opinion is well described by H. C. G. Matthew's *The Liberal Imperialists* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973); and well reflected in the essays in the boldly titled *Rearing an Imperial Race*, ed. Charles F. Hecht (London: Published for the National Food Reform Association, 1913).

[26] G. A. N. Lowndes, *The Silent Social Revolution: An Account of the Expansion of Public Education in England and Wales, 1895-1935* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 233; B. C. Roberts, *Trades Union Congress, 1868-1921* (London: George Allen & Urwin Ltd., 1958); and J. R. Hay, *The Origins of the Liberal Welfare Reforms, 1906-1914* (London: The Macmillan Press, 1975), pp. 43-44. Although his interpretation on working-class opposition to the welfare state rests on slim evidence, also see Henry Pelling's *Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain* (London: Macmillan, 1968), Chap. 1.

[27] *Times* (London), 15 Nov. 1899, p. 12.

[28] Thomas J. Macnamara, "In Corpore Sano," *Contemporary Review* (February 1905): 248; and idem, "Physical Condition of Working Class Children," *Nineteenth Century* 56 (August 1904): 307-11.

[29] Relevant literature includes William Leuchtenberg, "Progressivism and Imperialism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39 (December 1952): 483-504; William Appleman Williams, *The Contours of American History* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1961); Thomas J. McCormick, *China Market* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967); John Morton Blum, *Woodrow Wilson and the Politics of Morality* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1956); and Norman Gordon Levin, *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).

[30] See Bulick and Ayres, *Medical Inspection*. Ayres was the General Superintendent of Schools of Puerto Rico between 1906 and 1908.

[31] Ibid., Chaps. 1 and 12.

[32] Jonathan Taylor, "Free Schools," *Justice* 1 (1884): 2.

[33] William T. Stead, "'Food-Aided Education': Experiments in Paris, London, and Birmingham," *Review of Reviews* 3 (July 1891): 618.

[34] Hunter, *Poverty*, p. 216.

[35] "The Hunger Problem in the Public Schools--What A Canvas of Six Big Cities Reveals," *Philadelphia North American*, 21 May 1905.

[36] Eleanor Larrabee Lattimore, "School Lunches," *The Common Good* 5 (April 1912): 19.

[37] *Toledo Blade*, 4 Nov. 1908. This principal added that, "I have found that in most cases the families were doing all they could for the child."

[38] *Toledo News-Bee*, 3 Nov. 1908; *Toledo Blade* 6 Oct. 1908 and 4 Nov. 1908.

[39] *Toledo News-Bee*, 11 Mar. 1912.

[40] *Milwaukee Free Press*, 21 Oct. 1906. *The Milwaukee Sentinel* added on October 4, 1908, that hungry children became truants and then roam the streets until "they augment the growing army of tramps, prostitutes, car barn bandits, holdup men."

[41] *Milwaukee Free Press*, 5 Mar. 1911.

[42] *Missouri Staats-Zeitung*, 6 Apr. 1906; and the paper's interest in Robert Hunter's investigations on underfed children for January 5, 1906.

[43] *Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education*, 21 Oct. 1908.

[44] Rutherford H. Platt, "A Consideration of State Intervention in the Field of Charity," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction* (1908): 21.

[45] *New York Times*, 11 June 1909. The editor applauded the work of Joseph Lee, the playground enthusiast who opposed meal programs. On Lee's concern with preserving the autonomy and independence of the family, see "The Integrity of the Family," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Cor-*

rection (1909): 122-23.

[46] Proceedings of the Sixth Triennial of the Council of Jewish Women (Chicago: Toby Rubovits, 1911), p. 564; William J. Reese, "Between Home and School: Organized Parents, Clubwomen, and Urban Education in the Progressive Era," School Review 87 (November 1978): 3-28; and Louise Stevens Bryant, School Feeding: Its History and Practice at Home and Abroad (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1913), p. 180.

[47] Caroline Hunt, "The Daily Meals of School Children," U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 3 (Washington, D. C., 1909), pp. 13, 21-23; Lucy A. Osbourne, "The School Luncheon," Pedagogical Seminary 19 (June 1912): 204-17; and Bryant, School Feeding, p. 164.

[48] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 11 Apr. 1895.

[49] Women's Educational and Industrial Union Scrapbook, 1897; and Yearbook of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 1896-1897 (Rochester, 1897), pp. 5, 25-26 (W.E.I.U. Papers).

[50] Katherine Talbot Hodge, History of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, typescript, n.d., pp. 10-11 (Rochester Public Library, Rochester, New York).

[51] Toledo Evening Bee, 12 Nov. 1899. The editor said whether parents or the state paid the bill, reformers should "give every child a fair show to start in life with the best physical and mental health possible."

[52] Toledo Blade, 24 Nov. 1905. Also see the muckraking essay in the Toledo News-Bee, 17 Nov. 1904.

[53] Toledo Blade, 15 Nov. 1906.

[54] Toledo News-Bee and the Toledo Blade, 24 Jan. 1908. On Steinem, see the Bee and the Blade, 8 Dec. 1908.

[55] Toledo Evening Bee, 12 Dec. 1908 and 4 Feb. 1909. On the selection of particular schools, see the Toledo Blade, 4 Nov. 1908.

[56] Milwaukee Daily News, 29 Oct. 1904. The nutrition project's origins can be traced in the Milwaukee Sentinel, 1 Oct. 1904; 1 Nov. 1904; in the Milwaukee Free Press, 1 Oct. 1904; 1 Nov. 1904; and in the News, 1 Nov. 1904; 16 Feb. 1905; 19 Feb. 1905; and 4 Feb. 1906. Also see Mrs. Duane Mowry, "Penny Lunches

in Milwaukee Public Schools," American City 4 (June 1911): 283-85.

[57] This information is drawn from the Milwaukee Daily News, 1 Dec. 1906; 30 Mar. 1907; 13 Apr. 1907; 1 Feb. 1908; 25 Feb. 1908; Milwaukee Sentinel, 15 Jan. 1907; 31 Oct. 1907; 30 Nov. 1907; and Milwaukee School Proceedings, 4 Feb. 1908.

[58] Milwaukee Daily News, 17 Apr. 1909.

[59] For useful introductions to the implementation of school meals, read Bryant, School Feeding: Hunt, "The Daily Meals of School Children"; and John C. Gebhart, Malnutrition and School Feeding (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Bureau of Education Department of the Interior, 1922). The documentation on the role of women's groups and school meals is extensive. See, for example, Mary E. L. Small, "Elementary School Lunches under School Department Direction, Buffalo, New York," Journal of Home Economics 4 (December 1912): 490-92; idem, "Educational and Social Possibilities of School Lunches," Journal of Home Economics 6 (December 1914): 432-39; and "School Lunches in New York City," School and Society 11 (January 3, 1920): 20.

[60] Annual Report for 1910 of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education (London: Published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), p. 253; Phyllis D. Winder, The Public Feeding of Elementary School Children: A Review of the General Situation, and An Inquiry into the Birmingham Experience (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1913), pp. 18, 24; and M. E. Bulkley, The Feeding of School Children (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1914), pp. 59-76, 219-29.

[61] The extensive criticisms and arguments made by the Rochester Catholics have already been documented in the previous chapter.

[62] Toledo News-Bee, 23 Nov. 1909. Socialist inspired programs, warned the group, "arrest the right and duty of parents to see to the education of their children."

[63] Milwaukee Leader, 5 Mar. 1915 and 13 Feb. 1917. Further documentation on the support of the Milwaukee Socialists for free school meals is in footnote 17. Also see George Allen England, "Milwaukee's Socialist Government," Review of Reviews 42 (October 1910): 446.

[64] Benjamin J. Blied, Three Archbishops of Milwaukee (Milwaukee, 1955), p. 133.

[65] Social Democratic Herald, 2 Oct. 1909.

[66] Louise Stevens Bryant, "The School Feeding Movement," Psychological Clinic 6 (April 1912): 37.

[67] E. Mather Sill, "Dietary Studies of Undernourished School Children in New York City," Journal of the American Medical Association (November 1909): 1890. Cf. "A Study of Malnutrition in the School Child," Journal of the American Medical Association (November 1909): 713.

[68] C. G. Kerley, quoted in Sill, "Dietary Studies," p. 1891. Also see Bryant, "The School Feeding Movement," p. 37.

[69] Toledo Union Leader, 24 Jan. 1908.

[70] Bulkley's The Feeding of School Children is not only an excellent critique of school meals policy in England but contains a useful introduction to nutritional policy in other nations in the appendix.

[71] "Medical Inspection of School Children," Charities 16 (April 7, 1906): 3-4.

[72] Leonard P. Ayres, "What American Cities Are Doing For the Health of School Children," Annals of the American Academy 37 (March 1911): 499.

[73] Daniel V. McClure, "Medical Inspection of Schools," American Education 14 (February 1911): 252.

[74] A. T. S., "The Public Schools as a Centre of Social Service," Education 25 (Fall 1905): 378.

[75] "The Physician in the School," Nation 85 (August 29, 1907): 180; and idem, "Health in the Public Schools," (January 21, 1909): 56, where the editor argued that "the good old virtues of industry and punctuality are still more effective at school than an operation for adenoids."

[76] James D. Stewart, "Medical Inspection of School Children," Proceedings of the National Conference on Charities and Correction 37 (1910): 197. For other expressions of this view, consult G. W. Wharton, "Health of School Children," Outlook 84 (November 17, 1906): 662-66; Lillian D. Wald, "Medical Inspection of Public Schools," Annals of the American Academy 25 (March 1905): 290-98; and "The Physical Examination of School Children," American Education 14 (April 1911): 346, where the editor asserted that various "physical defects result in the retardation and discouragement of a large number of school children and render

the schools much less effective than they should be."

[77] John D. Cronin, "The Doctor in the Public Schools," Review of Reviews 35 (April 1907): 439. "Moral obliquity, of which truancy is the first manifestation in school life, goes hand in hand with physical defects."

[78] Laura H. Wild, "The Relation of Health to Efficiency," Education 33 (December 1912): 212; Brown, "A Firmer Physical Foundation for Education," p. 505; and Walter S. Cornell, Health and Medical Inspection of School Children (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, Publishers, 1912), passim.

[79] Cronin, "The Doctor in the Public Schools," p. 440. For an understanding of the eugenics movement, examine Mark Haller's Eugenics (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1963).

[80] Clarence Karier, "Testing for Order and Control in the Corporate Liberal State," in Clarence Karier, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973), pp. 108-37.

[81] "The Physician in the School," p. 180. Verbal attacks on parents were commonplace, as evidenced in Severance Burrage, "Medical Inspection of School Children," Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. 37 (1898): 540; Walter S. Cornell, "Physical Care of Children," Anals of the American Academy 37 (March 1911): 487-93; and "Health Improvement a Duty of the School," American Education 21 (June 1918): 490.

[82] "Health Improvement a Duty of the School," p. 480.

[83] W. B. Powell, "Medical Inspection of Schools," Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N.E.A. (1898): 458-59; John B. Cronin, "School Children and their Medical Supervision," Charities 16 (April 7, 1906): 61; "The Physician in the School," p. 80; and J. R. Schmidt, "Filling Teeth to Cure Dullness," Technical World 19 (July 1913): 738-39.

[84] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 15 Mar. 1901; 16 Mar. 1901; 26 Mar. 1901; and 11 Apr. 1901; Proceedings of the Rochester School Board, 11 Apr. 1901 and two essays by Goler: "Medical School Inspection--A Way to Child Welfare," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction 38 (1911): 98-103; and "Medical Inspection in Rochester," American City 9 (October 1913): 317-20.

[85] Rochester Union and Advertiser, 31 Jan. 1905; George Goler, "The School as a Health Center," The Common Good 5 (July 1912):

21-23; idem, "Medical School Inspection," p. 9[illegible] and Madel C. Goodwin, "The School Nurse," *The Common Good* 4 (February 1911): 15-16.

[86] *Toledo Evening Bee*, 19 Nov. 1901; 20 Nov. 1901; 26 Feb. 1908; *Toledo Blade*, 19 Nov. 1901; 6 Dec. 1907; 7 Dec. 1909; and 17 May 1910.

[87] On Milwaukee, see the numerous annual reports by medical inspectors in the *Milwaukee School Reports*, as well as *Medical Inspection in the Schools of Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: Milwaukee City Club Committee on Public Health, 1919), pp. 1-16. (This pamphlet is in the rare pamphlet collection of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.) On Kansas City, see the *Kansas City School Report, 1910*, pp. 33-34; *Kansas City and Its Schools* (Kansas City: Prepared for the Members of the Department of Superintendence of the N.E.A., 1917), pp. 10-11, 59; and M. A. Brown, "Health Program in the Kansas City Schools, 1919-1921," *Elementary School Journal* 22 (October 1921): 132-39.

[88] Lattimore, "School Lunches," p. 19.

[89] *Toledo School Report*, 1911, p. 55.

[90] *Milwaukee School Report, 1913*, pp. 167-72.

[91] Ibid., p. 167; and "The Dental Clinic," in *Milwaukee School Report, 1911*, p. 82; *Toledo School Report, 1911*, p. 55; and Lattimore, "School Lunches," p. 19. There was a large literature on the relationship of good teeth, overall health, and academic proficiency, as exemplified in Cornell, "Physical Care of Children," p. 488; "The Physical Examination of School Children," p. 346; W. C. Reavis, "Dental Examination of School Children," *Elementary School Children* 11 (October 1910): 90-98; and George P. Barth, "Health Supervision of Working Children," *American Child* 1 (May 1919), p. 45.

[92] Jacob Sobel, "Prejudices and Superstitions Met With in the Medical Inspection of School Children," in *Fourth International Congress on School Hygiene* 4 (Buffalo: The Courier Company of Buffalo, 1914): 78.

[93] Terman, *Health Work in the Schools*, p. 12. Terman especially disliked the League for Medical Freedom.

[94] Cornell, *Health and Medical Inspection*, p. 75.

[95] Ibid., p. 73.

[96] Toledo News-Bee, 18 Jan. 1907; Rochester Socialist, 17 Jan. 1908; and Goler, "The School as a Health Center," pp. 23-24. Goler called for the use of school psychologists to diagnose the problems "of all backward, deficient and defective children, so that from this beginning there may grow up a laboratory of hygiene and psychology for the study of all well children. Society is responsible for making sick children, deficients and defectives, and we must of course, first establish a laboratory for the study of those we have made. Later, as society stops developing defectives, we may then try to study those children who exhibit but slight departures from the normal."

[97] Cornell, Health Work in the Schools, pp. 73-74.

[98] Miriam Cominsky, "Report of the Fourth Ward School Nurse," The Common Good 6 (October 1913): 7.

[99] J. W. Hodge, "Vaccination an Empirical Art," Arena 38 (December 1907): 664.

[100] "Anti-Vaccinationists," Outlook 96 (October 22, 1910): 365.

[101] Kansas City Mail, 16 Jan. 1893.

[102] "No man is wise enough to divine the result of putting any animal poison into the system of anybody by vaccination; it may be harmless, or it may be like a spark like the magazine, setting in motion unseen or dormant forces which shall injure health or result in death," argued William B. Hidden, "Dangers of Vaccination," North American Review 159 (July 1894): 125.

[103] Rochester, Democrat and Chronicle, 5 Sept. 1894. The paper called the compulsory law "despotic paternalism" on March 19, 1895.

[104] The details of the case are conveniently located in an article in the Rochester Union and Advertiser, 4 Dec. 1912.

[105] Toledo Evening Bee, 22 Jan. 1903. The details on boycotts and trouble in the Lagrange area in particular are sketched in the Bee, 15 Jan. 1902; 16 Jan. 1902; 30 Sept. 1902; 1 Oct. 1902; 23 Jan. 1903; and Toledo Blade, 20 Jan. 1903; 26 Jan. 1903; and 5 Feb. 1903.

[106] Toledo Evening Bee, 21 Jan. 1903.

[107] Toledo Blade, 5 Jan. 1914.

[108] *Toledo Blade*, 27 Jan. 1914. The boycott can be traced in idem, 16 Dec. 1913; 5 Jan. 1914; 6 Jan. 1914; 16 Jan. 1914; 17 Jan. 1914; 19 Jan. 1914; and 26 Jan. 1914; *Toledo News-Bee*, 2 Jan. 1914; 3 Jan. 1914; 5 Jan. 1914; 17 Jan. 1914; and 19 Jan. 1914.

[109] Karier, "Testing for Order and Control." For a careful and detailed social history of the education of the feeble-minded in Milwaukee during the Progressive era, consult Anne Bennison's forthcoming dissertation, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

[110] Leonard Ayres' findings in *Open-Air Schools* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1910) were compatible with local appraisals in many cities.

[111] Charles Creighton, "Vaccination: A Scientific Study," *Arena* 2 (September 1890): 422.

[112] John C. Burnham, "Medical Specialists and Movements Toward Social Control in the Progressive Era," in Jerry Israel, ed. *Building the Organizational Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1972), p. 23.

[113] *Toledo News-Bee*, 14 Mar. 1917; City Club of Milwaukee, *Medical Inspection*, p. 11; and Brown, "Health Program," p. 137.

"Notes to Chapter 10"

[1] Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Random House, 1955), p. 272.

[2] See especially the pertinent essays in Clarence J. Karier, Paul C. Violas, and Joel Spring, eds., *Roots of Crisis* (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973); and Spring, "Psychologists and the War: The Meaning of Intelligence in the Alpha and Beta Tests," *History of Education Quarterly* 12 (Spring 1972): 3-15.

[3] *The Toledo Union*, 12 June 1897.

[4] *Toledo Union Leader*, 24 May 1912 and 12 Nov. 1915. Workers in many cities commonly complained that they were "common fodder" in every war.

[5] F. T. C. *Minutes*, 16 June 1915. Anti-war and pacifist sentiment across the country was well documented in the *Milwaukee Leader* throughout the war years.

[6] F. T. C. *Minutes*, 4 June 1916.

[7] Lewis Paul Todd, *Wartime Relations of the Federal Government and the Public Schools, 1917-1918* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945), p. 85.

[8] Ibid. Also see the *Toledo Union Leader*, 24 May 1912.

[9] Women's organizations did not condone war and often attacked its glorification by some citizens. Yet they often cited the past role of women in caring for the diseased and the downcast members of society. They always emphasized that men rather than women caused wars. On the domestic environment during the war, see Blake McKelvey, *Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), Chap. 10; and John M. Killits, *Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio, 1623-1923* 3 vols. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1923), 1: 201-09; H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War, 1917-1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1957); Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare: A Study of National Hysteria, 1919-1920* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1955); and David P. Thelen, *Robert M. LaFollette and the Insurgent Spirit* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976).

[10] *Toledo Blade*, 22 Feb. 1916. The plan was described in idem, 8 Feb. 1916. Labor opposition was also registered in the *Toledo*

Union Leader, 18 Feb. 1916; 3 Mar. 1916; and 10 Mar. 1916.

[11] Toledo News-Bee, 28 Apr. 1917.

[12] On Sherwood, see the Toledo Union Leader , 12 Nov. 1915; Toledo News-Bee, 7 Mar. 1917; and Toledo Blade, 7 Jan. 1916; 10 Feb. 1916; and 10 Nov. 1916.

[13] Toledo Blade, 17 Mar. 1916.

[14] Toledo News-Bee, 14 Feb. 1917.

[15] Toledo News-Bee, 9 Mar. 1917. The Nearing controversy can be traced very easily in the Toledo Blade, 6 Apr. 1916; 13 Oct. 1916; 9 Apr. 1917; in Toledo Union Leader, 9 June 1916; 16 Mar. 1917; 23 Mar. 1917; 13 Apr. 1917; and in the News-Bee, 14 Feb. 1917; 10 Mar. 1917; and 12 Mar. 1917.

[16] Toledo Blade, 11 Sept. 1915.

[17] Toledo News-Bee, 5 July 1917; 10 Oct. 1917; 19 Oct. 1917; 24 Oct. 1917; and 26 Oct. 1917.

[18] Toledo Blade, 20 Mar. 1919. On Guitteau and the Committee, examine the same newspaper for 19 Mar. 1917; 21 Mar. 1917; and 5 Apr. 1917.

[19] Toledo News-Bee, 21 May 1917.

[20] Toledo Blade, 29 Mar. 1918.

[21] Toledo Union Leader, 14 Sept. 1917.

[22] Milwaukee Sentinel, 8 Mar. 1918 and 27 Mar. 1918.

[23] Meta Berger, unpublished autobiography, pp. 59-60.

[24] Ibid., p. 60.

[25] The war-related tensions in Milwaukee are described and analyzed in Lorin Lee Cary, "The Wisconsin Loyalty Legion, 1917-1918," Wisconsin Magazine of History 53 (Autumn 1969): 33-50; William B. Bruce, I Was Born in America (Milwaukee, 1937), Chap. 17; and Sally Miller, Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973), Chap. 9. Also see the letters from the Civic Secretary of the City Club

to C. N. Waldron, January 23, 1917, which explains that war subjects, like religious topics, were taboo. (City Club of Milwaukee Papers)

[26] Oscar Ameringer, *If You Don't Weaken* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1940), pp. 305, 323-24.

[27] See, for example, the following letters: Marie K. Whitnall (S. D. P. Branch #21) to Victor Berger, August 29, 1914; Bohemian Branch "Volnost" to Victor Berger, February, 1916; and Victor Berger to Anton Jecmen, February 16, 1916. (Social Democratic Party Collection, Milwaukee County Historical Society, Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

[28] *Milwaukee School Proceedings*, 30 June 1916. The *Milwaukee Leader* described the explosive scene on the following day.

[29] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 1 July 1916.

[30] *Milwaukee Leader*, 20 Feb. 1917.

[31] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 23 Mar. 1917.

[32] The *Milwaukee Sentinel* and many anti-socialists enjoyed the war-related work and the defeats of the Social Democrats immeasurably. See the *Sentinel* on 7 Feb. 1917; 4 Apr. 1917; 14 Feb. 1918; and 6 Apr. 1918. In the last newspaper account cited, "Kiddies in City in Loyalty Parade," the paper described the parade at the Detroit Street School in the heart of "Little Italy." Marching to the best beat of fife and drum, "The children marched by fours, carrying flags, Liberty Loan posters, and other patriotic slogans." On the curtailment of social center use and charges of sedition, consult the *Milwaukee School Proceedings*, 2 Oct. 1917; 14 Dec. 1917; and 2 Jan. 1918.

[33] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 12 Oct. 1917.

[34] *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 2 July 1917.

[35] These activities can be traced in the *Milwaukee School Proceedings* during the war years. Elizabeth Thomas' actions are covered in the *Milwaukee Leader*, 17 Oct. 1917; and are more critically analyzed in the *Milwaukee Sentinel*, 18 Oct. 1917.

[36] Meta Berger, unpublished autobiography, p. 60.

[37] *Milwaukee Leader*, 6 Mar. 1918.

[38] *Milwaukee Leader*, 8 Nov. 1918; and Edward Muzik, "Victor Berger: Congress and the Red Scare," *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 47 (Summer 1964): 309-19. In his editorial in the *Leader*, Berger asserted that the Socialist victories were a protest against the denial of civil liberties: "It was a rebuke to autocracy. There is a limit to the amount of arrogant bullying the people will stand."

[39] *Milwaukee School Proceedings*, 30 June 1919.

[40] "1932 Municipal Platform of Socialist Party of Milwaukee," in Daniel Hoan, *City Government: The Record of the Milwaukee Experiment* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, c. 1974), pp. 336-38.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Note on Sources:

Because of the wide number of community organizations and social reforms examined in this dissertation, it is impossible to provide a comprehensive bibliography for national materials as well as for Kansas City, Milwaukee, Rochester, and Toledo. Instead, I have provided an introduction to the historical literature and the most important sources for each city. The footnotes provided after each chapter present more complete sources.

For the local level, I read for each of the four cities at least the major Democratic and Republican newspapers for each day between 1890 and 1920. They were supplemented by labor papers, Socialist papers, and other weekly and daily newspapers on particular subjects. Together with available manuscript collections, newspapers were the most important source in reconstructing the political and social organizations that implemented many Progressive school reforms. School reports, minutes, and proceedings are listed for each individual city.

To provide a wider understanding of national trends in social and political reform in the Progressive era, I tried to read broadly on such reforms as lunch programs, social centers, playgrounds, vacation schools, medical inspection, and other innovations. For the women's movement, I read the *Proceedings of the General Federation of Women's Clubs* (1893-1920), the *Proceedings of the National Council of Jewish Women* (1893-1920), and numerous periodicals that shed light on women and social reform.

Periodical literature for the Progressive era contains a goldmine of information on community organizations and school innovations. Space limitations prevent listing the various articles, which are contained in the footnotes of individual chapters. Consistently, the most valuable magazines and journals were the following:

American City

American Education

Annals of the American Academy

Arena

Charities and the Commons

Child-Welfare Magazine

Education

Educational Review

Elementary School Teacher

The Forum

Independent

International Socialist Review

Journal of Education

Journal of Home Economics

Ladies' Home Journal

Municipal Affairs

The Nation

National Education Association, Proceedings and Addresses

North American Review

The Outlook

Pedagogical Seminary

Psychological Clinic

The Playground

Review of Reviews

School and Home Education

School and Society

School Review

Teachers College Record

U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletins

World's Work

Articles and Books:

Ayres, Leonard P. Open-Air Schools. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1910.

Bell, Daniel. *Marxian Socialism in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Bowers, C. A. "Ideologies of Progressive Education." *History of Education Quarterly* 7 (Winter 1967): 452-73.

Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Buenker, John D.; Burnham, John C.; and Crunden, Robert M. *Progressivism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1977.

Buenker, John D. *Urban Liberalism and Progressive Reform*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1978.

Bullough, William A. *Cities and Schools in the Gilden Age*. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1974.

Butterworth, Julian. *The Parent-Teacher Association and Its Work*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1928.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Cohen, Ronald D., and Mohl, Raymond A. *The Paradox of Progressive Education*. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1979.

Conway, Jill. "Women Reformers in American Culture, 1870-1930." *Journal of Social History* 5 (1971-72): 164-82.

Cremin, Lawrence. *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Random House, 1961.

Davis, Allen F. *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Dorr, Rheta Childe. *What Eight Million Women Want*. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1910.

Dutton, Samuel T. and David Snedden. *The Administration of Public Education in the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.

Ebner, Michael H., and Tobin, Eugene M., eds. *The Age of Urban Reform*. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1977.

Gaylin, Willard; Glasser, Ira; Marcus, Steven; and Rothman, David. *Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Goodwyn, Lawrence. *Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in*

America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Gould, Lewis L., ed. *The Progressive Era*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974.

Gulick, Luther H., and Ayres, Leonard P. *Medical Inspection of Schools*. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1908.

Haber, Samuel. *Efficiency and Uplift*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Hays, Samuel P. *The Response to Industrialism, 1885-1914*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Hays, Samuel P. "The Politics of Reform of Municipal Government in the Progressive Era." *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 40 (October 1964): 153-64.

Hoag, Ernest Byrant, and Terman, Lewis M. *Health Work in the Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform: From Byran to F.D.R.* New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

Hunter, Robert. *Poverty*. New York: Harper & Row, c. 1965.

Kaestle, Carl F. "Social Reform and the Urban School." *History of Education Quarterly* 12 (Summer 1972): 211-28.

Kaestle, Carl F., and Vinovskis, Maris. *Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Karier, Clarence J.; Violas, Paul C.; and Spring, Joel H. *Roots of Crisis*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973.

Katz, Michael B. *The Irony of Early School Reform*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Keller, Morton. *Affairs of State: Public Life in Late Nineteenth Century America*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977.

King, Irving. *Social Aspects of Education*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912.

Kolko, Gabriel. *The Triumph of Conservatism*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.

Krug, Edward A. *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Lazerson, Marvin. *Origins of the Urban School: Public Education* *in Massachusetts, 1870-1915*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Miliband, Ralph. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Nearing, Scott. *The New Education: A Review of Progressive Educational Movements*. Chicago: Row, Peterson, 1915.

O'Neill, William L. *Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Perry, Clarence A. *Wider Use of the School Plant*. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910.

Quint, Howard H. *The Forging of American Socialism*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1953.

Rice, Bradley Robert. *Progressive Cities*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.

Schlossman, Steven L. "Before Home Start: Notes toward a History of Parent Education in America: 1897-1929." *Harvard Educational Review* 46 (August 1976): 436-67.

Schlossman, Steven L. *Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Shannon, David A. *The Socialist Party of America*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1955.

Smith, Timothy L. "Progressivism in American Education, 1880-1900." *Harvard Educational Review* 31 (Spring 1961): 168-93.

Spargo, John. *The Bitter Cry of the Children*. New York: Quadrangle Books, c. 1968.

Spring, Joel H. *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Troen, Selwyn. *The Public and the Schools: Shaping the St. Louis System*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1975.

Tyack, David B. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Urban, Wayne. "Organized Teachers and Educational Reform during the Progressive Era: 1890-1920." *History of Education Quarterly*. 16 (Spring 1976): 35-52.

Violas, Paul C. *The Training of the Urban Working Class*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1978.

Weinstein, James. *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Weinstein, James. *The Decline of Socialism in America.* New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920.* New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

Wiebe, Robert H. "The Social Functions of Public Education." *American Quarterly* 21 (Summer 1969): 147-64.

Wirth, Arthur G. *Education in the Technological Society.* Scranton, Pa.: Intext Educational Publishers, 1972.

KANSAS CITY

Articles and Books:

Barclay, Thomas S. "The Kansas City Charter of 1875." *Missouri Historical Review* 26 (October 1931): 19-39.

Brown, A. Theodore. *Frontier Community: Kansas City to 1870.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1963.

Brown, A. Theodore, and Dorsett, Lyle W. *K. C.: A History of Kansas Missouri.* Boulder, Col.: Pruett Publishing Company, 1978.

Ellis, Roy. *A Civic History of Kansas City, Missouri.* Springfield, Mo.: Press of Elkins-Swyers Co., 1930.

Conrad, Howard L. *Encyclopedia of the History of Missouri.* Vol. 3, 5. New York: The Southern History Co., 1901.

Greenwood, James M. *Principles of Education Practically Applied.* D. Appleton and Co., 1887.

Griffith, William. *History of Kansas City.* Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co., 1900.

Haskell, Henry C., Jr. and Fowler, Richard B. *City of the Future: A Narrative History of Kansas City, 1850-1950.* Kansas City: Frank Glenn Publishing Co., 1950.

Hollister, Wilfred R. and Harry Norman. *Five Famous Missourians.* Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co., 1900.

Imperial Kansas City: 1900. Kansas City: Mercantile Illustrating Co., 1900.

Kansas City and Its Public Schools. Kansas City: Prepared for the Members of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, 1917.

Kansas City Teachers Bulletin, 1920-1929 (State Historical Society of Missouri).

McCarthy, Mary L. "Recollections of Kansas City, 1866-1916." *Missouri Historical Review* 45 (October 1950): 35-46.

McEwen & Dillenback. *Kansas City in 1879*. Kansas City: Press of Ramsey, Millett, & Hudson, 1879.

Military Training in the Kansas City High Schools. Kansas City, 1917. (Kansas City Public Library).

Miller, W. H. *The History of Kansas City*. Kansas City: Birdsall & Miller, 1881.

Missouri Educator, 1858-1860 (State Historical Society of Missouri).

Missouri School Journal, 1883-1920 (State Historical Society of Missouri).

Nagel, Paul C. *Missouri*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1977.

Parrish, William E. *Missouri Under Radical Rule, 1865-1870*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1965.

Parrish, William E. *A History of Missouri*. Columbia, University of Missouri Press, 1973.

Penn and Sunlight Sketches of Kansas City and Environs. Kansas City: Phoenix Publishing Co., 1892.

Phillips, Claude A. "A Century of Education in Missouri." *Missouri Historical Review* 15 (January 1921): 298-314.

Shoemaker, Floyd Calvin. *Missouri and Missourians*. Vol. 1-5. Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1943.

Whitney, Carrie Westlake. *Kansas City, Missouri: Its History and Its People, 1808-1908*. Vol. 1. Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1908.

Wohl. R. Richard and Brown, A. Theodore. "The Usable Past: A Study of Historical Traditions in Kansas City." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 23 (May 1960): 237-59.

Dissertations and Theses:

Galloway, Dorothy. "James Mickleborough Greenwood: An Evaluation of His Services as an Educator and His Contributions to Educational Thought." Master's Thesis, Washington University, 1931.

Glauert, Ralph Edward. "Education and Society in Ante-Bellum Missouri." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1973.

Hanks, Glen Lester. "The Development of Public School Finance in the Kansas City School District." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1953.

McCorkle, William L. "Nelson's Star and Kansas City, 1880-1898." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1968.

Oster, Donald Bright. "Community Image in the History of Saint Louis and Kansas City." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1967.

Wagner, Patricia Youmans. "Voluntary Associations in Kansas City, Missouri, 1870-1900." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas City, 1962.

Manuscripts:

Pertinent manuscripts are found in the Kansas City Public Library (KCPL) and in the Western Historical Manuscripts Collection (WHMC) on the University of Missouri-Columbia campus. The Kansas City School Reports, 1869-1920, are located at the Kansas City Public Library and the State Historical Society of Missouri.

James M. Greenwood Papers (KCPL)

Missouri State Federation of Women's Clubs Papers (WHMC)

Robert T. Van Horn Papers (KCPL)

Newspapers:

The following newspapers are located at the State Historical Society of Missouri (SHSM) and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW).

Kansas City Journal of Commerce, 1864-1910 (SHSM)

Kansas City Labor, 1895 (SHSW)

Kansas City Mail, 1892-1902 (daily) (SHSM)

Kansas City Mail, 1895-1900 (weekly) (SHSM)

Kansas City Presse, 1898-1912 (SHSM)

Kansas City Reform, 1900-1901, 1903-1909 (SHSM)

Kansas City Star, 1880-1907 (SHSW, SHSM)

Kansas City Times, 1872-1911 (SHSM)

The Kriterion, 1904-1905, 1907 (SHSM)

Labor Herald, 1901 (SHSM)

Labor Herald, 1904-1920 (SHSM)

Midland Mechanic, 1898-1900 (SHSW)

Missouri Staats-Zeitung, 1898-1907, 1909-1917 (SHSM)

The People's Advocate, 1902 (SHSM)

The Toiler, 1913-1915 (SHSW)

MILWAUKEE

Articles and Books:

Ameringer, Oscar. If You Don't Weaken. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1940.

Borun, Thaddeus, ed. We, the Milwaukee Poles. Milwaukee: Nowiny Publishing Co., 1946.

Berger, Victor L. Broadsides. Milwaukee: Social-Democratic Publishing Co., 1913.

Blied, Rev. Benjamin J. Three Archbishops of Milwaukee. Milwaukee, 1955.

Bruce, William G. A Short History of Milwaukee. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1936.

Bruce, William G., ed. History of Milwaukee, City and County. Vol. 1-3. Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Company, 1922.

City Club News, 1915-1920 (State Historical Society of Wisconsin).

Conrad, Howard Louis, ed. History of Milwaukee. Vol. 1-3. Chicago: American Biographical Publishing Co., 1896.

Conzen, Kathleen Neils. Immigrant Milwaukee, 1836-1860. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Donnelly, Patrick. "The Milwaukee Public Schools." In The Columbian History of Education in Wisconsin, edited by John William Stearns. Milwaukee: Press of the Evening Wisconsin Co., 1893.

Flower, Frank A. History of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Vol. 1-2. Chicago: The Western Historical Co., 1881.

Gavett, Thomas W. Development of the Labor Movement in Milwaukee. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Gregory, John G. History of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Vol. 1-2. Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1931.

History of the Milwaukee Social-Democratic Victories. Milwaukee: Social-Democratic Publishing Co., 1911.

Hoan, Daniel W. City Government: The Record of the Milwaukee Experiment. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, c. 1974.

Korman, Gerd. Industrialization, Immigrants, and Americanizers: The View from Milwaukee, 1866-1921. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967.

Lamers, William. Our Roots Grow Deep. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools, 1974.

Margulies, Herbert F. The Decline of the Progressive Movement in Wisconsin, 1890-1920. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1968.

Mears, Louise W. Life and Times of a Midwest Educator. Lincoln, Neb.: The State Journal Printing Co., 1944.

Miller, Sally M. Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism, 1910-1920. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Mooney, Patricia Melvin. "Make Milwaukee Safe for Babies: The Child Welfare Commission and the Development of Urban Health Centers, 1911-1912." Journal of the West 17 (April 1978): 83-93.

Pienkos, Donald. "Politics, Religion, and Change in Polish Milwaukee, 1900-1930." Wisconsin Magazine of History 61 (Spring 1978): 179-209.

Pieplow, William L. History of the South Division Civic Association. Milwaukee: The Milwaukee Times, 1947.

Schafer, Joseph. "Origin of Wisconsin's Free School System." Wisconsin Magazine of History 9 (1925-1926): 27-46.

School Monthly, 1867-1870. (State Historical Society of Wisconsin).

Stave, Bruce, ed. Socialism and the Cities. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1975.

Still, Bayrd. Milwaukee: The History of a City. Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1948.

Thelen, David P. The New Citizenship: Origins of Progressivism in Wisconsin, 1885-1900. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

Thompson, Carl D. Labor Measures of the Social Democrats. Milwaukee, ca. 1911.

Wachman, Marvin. History of the Social-Democratic Party of Milwaukee, 1897-1910. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1945.

Wisconsin Comrade, 1914-1916 (State Historical Society of Wisconsin).

Wisconsin Journal of Education, 1857-1920.

Youmans, Theodora W. "How Wisconsin Women Won the Ballot." Wisconsin Magazine of History 5 (1921-1922): 3-32.

Dissertations and Theses:

Clark, James Ira. "The Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1903-1921." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1961.

Olson, Frederick I. "The Milwaukee Socialists, 1897-1941." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.

Simon, Roger David. "The Expansion of an Industrial City: Milwaukee, 1880-1910." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1971.

Stachkowski, Floyd John. "The Political Career of Daniel Webster Hoan." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1966.

Van Pelt, Mark. "The Teacher and the Urban Community: Milwaukee, 1860-1900." Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1978.

Waligorski, Ann Shirley. "Social Action and Women: The Experience of Lizzie Black Kander." Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1969.

Manuscripts:

Except for the Morris Stern Papers, which are held privately by the Stern family, the most important manuscripts on Milwaukee for the period are at the Milwaukee County Historical Society (MCHS) and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW). The Milwaukee School Reports, 1848-1920, and the Proceedings of the Milwaukee School Board, 1880-1920, are accessible at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the Milwaukee Public Library.

Meta Berger Papers (SHSW)

City Club of Milwaukee Papers (SHSW)

Federated Trades Council Papers (SHSW)

Lizzie Black Kander Papers (SHSW, MCHS)

William Pieplow Papers (MCHS)

Milton Potter Papers (MCHS)

Emil Seidel Papers (SHSW)

Social Democratic Party Papers (MCHS)

Social Economics Club Papers (MCHS)

Social Science Club Papers (SHSW)

Morris Stern Papers (private)

Newspapers:

All of the Milwaukee newspapers for the Progressive era were consulted at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Germania Und Abend-Post, 1898-1910

Milwaukee Daily News, 1890-1915

Milwaukee Free Press, 1900-1915

Milwaukee Leader, 1911-1920

Milwaukee Sentinel, 1890-1920

Social Democratic Herald, 1898-1913

Voice of the People, 1910, 1918

Wisconsin Vorwarts, 1893-1920

ROCHESTER

Articles and Books:

The Common Good, 1907-1914 (University of Rochester Library).

Danforth, Mrs. Henry G. "Rochester's Gay Nineties." *Rochester Historical Society Publications* 20 (1942): 41-49.

Dow, Mrs. Harriet. "The Influence of Women in the Life of Rochester." In *Centennial History of Rochester, New York*, edited by Edward R. Foreman. Vol. 2. Rochester: Printed by John P. Smith Co., 1933.

Ellis, S. A. "A Brief History of the Public Schools of the City of Rochester." *Publications of the Rochester Historical Society* 1 (1892): 71-89.

Fisler, Patricia E. "The Depression of 1893 in Rochester." *Rochester History* 15 (June 1952): 1-24.

A History of the Public Schools of Rochester, New York, 1813-1935. Rochester: Board of Education, n.d. (Rochester Public Library, typescript).

Hodge, Katherine Talbot. *History of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, 1893-1943*. Rochester, 1943.

McGregor, A. Laura. "The Early History of the Rochester Public Schools, 1813-1850." In *The History of Education in Rochester* edited by Blake McKelvey. Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939.

McKelvey, Blake. *Rochester: The Water-Power City, 1812-1854*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

McKelvey, Blake. *Rochester: The Flower City, 1855-1890*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

McKelvey, Blake. *Rochester: The Quest for Quality, 1890-1925*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

McKelvey, Blake, ed. *The History of Education in Rochester*. Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939.

McKelvey, Blake. "A History of Social Welfare in Rochester." *Rochester History* 20 (October 1958): 1-28.

McKelvey, Blake. "Walter Rauschenbusch's Rochester." *Rochester History* 14 (October 1952): 1-27.

McKelvey, Blake. "Rochester Learns to Play: 1850-1900."

Rochester History 7 (July 1946): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "An Historical View of Rochester's Parks and Playgrounds." Rochester History 11 (January 1949): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "The Lure of the City: Rochester in the 1890s." Rochester History 28 (October 1966): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "Woman's Rights in Rochester: A Century of Progress." Rochester History 10 (July 1948): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "Rochester at the Turn of the Century." Rochester History 12 (January 1950): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "Susan B. Anthony." Rochester History 7 (April 1945): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "Organized Labor in Rochester before 1914." Rochester History 25 (January 1963): 1-24.

McKelvey, Blake. "Rochester's Public Schools: A Testing Ground for Community Policies." Rochester History 31 (April 1969): 1-28.

O'Reilly, Henry. Sketches of Rochester. Rochester: Published by William Alling, 1838.

Parker, Jenny March. Rochester. Rochester: Scrantom, Wetmore, and Company, 1884.

Perkins, Dexter. "Henry O'Reilly." Rochester History 7 (January 1945): 1-24.

Stevens, Edward W. "Social Centers, Politics, and Social Efficiency in the Progressive Era." History of Education Quarterly 12 (Spring 1972): 16-33.

Truesdale, Dorothy S. "The Three R's in Rochester, 1850-1900." In The History of Education in Rochester, edited by Blake McKelvey. Rochester: Published by the Society, 1939.

Ward, Edward J., ed. The Social Center. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913.

Weet, Herbert S. "The Development of Public Education in Rochester, 1900-1910." Publications of the Rochester Historical Society 17 (1939): 183-232.

Zwierlein, Frederick J. The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid. Vol. 1-3. Rochester, 1925.

Dissertations and Theses:

Cavallo, Dominick Joseph. "The Child in American Reform: A

Psychohistory of the Movement to Organize Children's Play, 1880-1920." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Stoney Brook, 1976.

Finfer, Lawrence A. "Leisure as Social Work in the Urban Community: The Progressive Recreation Movement, 1890-1920." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Stevens, Edward W. Jr., "The Political Education of Children in the Rochester Public Schools, 1899-1917: An Historical Perspective on Social Control in Public Education." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971.

Manuscripts:

The following manuscripts are located at the Rochester Public Library. Also located there are the *Rochester School Reports*, 1844-1910, and the *Proceedings of the Rochester School Board*, 1890-1920.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union Papers

Newspaper Scrapbook Collection, 1908-1913

Newspapers:

Rochester's newspapers are available at the Rochester Public Library, but this study was based on the holdings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW) and the Library of Congress (LC).

Labor Journal, 1903-1914 (SHSW)

Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 1890-1915 (LC)

Rochester Socialist, 1907-1908 (SHSW)

Rochester Union and Advertiser, 1890-1918 (LC)

TOLEDO

Articles and Books:

A History of Education in the State of Ohio. Columbus: The Gazette Printing House, 1876.

Anderson, Elaine S. "Pauline Steinem, Dynamic Immigrant." In *Women in Ohio History*, edited by Marta Whitlock. Columbus:

The Ohio Historical Society, 1976.

Barclay, Morgan. "Reform in Toledo: The Political Career of Samuel M. Jones." Northwest Ohio Quarterly 50 (Summer 1978): 79-89.

Biographical Cyclopaedia and Portrait Gallery. Vol. 1-2. Cincinnati: Western Biographical Publishing Co., 1884.

Bossing, Nelson L. The History of Educational Legislation in Ohio from 1851 to 1925. Columbus: The F. J. Heer Printing Co., 1931.

Bramble's Views: Toledo, Ohio: Diamond Anniversary, 1837-1912. Toledo: Bramble Publishing Co., 1912.

Burns, James J. Educational History of Ohio. Columbus: Historical Publishing Co., 1905.

Carlton, Frank Tracy. "Golden-Rule Factory." Arena 32 (October 1904): 408-10.

Carey, Lorin Lee. Guide to Research in the History of Toledo, Ohio. Toledo: University of Toledo, 1977.

Casson, Herbert N. "Draining a Political Swamp in Toledo." Arena 21 (June 1899): 768-71.

Commerce Club News, 1916-1917 (Toledo Public Library).

Crosby, Ernest. Golden Rule Jones. Chicago: The Public Publishing Co., 1906.

Downes, Randolph C. History of Lake Shore Ohio. Vol. 1-3. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1952.

Downes, Randolph C. Canal Days. Toledo: Published by the Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio, 1949.

Downes, Randolph C. Industrial Beginnings. Toledo: The Toledo Printing Co., 1954.

Downes, Randolph C. "The People's Schools: Popular Foundations of Toledo's Public School System." Northwest Ohio Quarterly 29 (Winter 1956-57): 9-26.

Folk, Richard A. "The Golden Age of Ohio Socialism." Northwest Ohio Quarterly 41 (Summer 1969): 91-112.

Gutgesell, Stephen. Guide to Ohio Newspapers, 1793-1973. Columbus: Ohio Historical Society, 1974.

Historical Sketches of Public Schools in Cities, Villages and

Townships of the State of Ohio. Columbus: Ohio State Centennial Committee, 1876.

Howe, Frederic C. The Confessions of a Reformer. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, c. 1967.

Johnson, Wendell F. Toledo's Non-Partisan Movement. Toledo: Press of the H. J. Crittenden Co., 1922.

Jones, Samuel M. The New Right: A Plea for Fair Play Through a More Just Social Order. New York: Eastern Book Concern, 1899.

Jones, Samuel M. Letters of Life and Labor. Toledo: The Franklin Printing and Engraving Co., 1900.

Jones, Samuel M. "Government by the Golden Rule." Munsey 28 (January 1903): 506-09.

Jones, Samuel M. "American Workingmen and Religion." Outlook 65 (July 14, 1900): 640-42.

Killits, John M. Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio, 1623-1923. Vol. 1-3. Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1952.

Laws, Annie, ed. History of the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs. Cincinnati: The Ebbert & Richardson Co., 1924.

"The Public School System of Toledo." Commerce Club News 4 (1919): 1-36.

Mettler, Peter J. Chronic des Deutschen Pionier Vereins von Toledo, Ohio. Toledo: Gilsdorf Printing Co., 1918.

Nevins, Allan, ed. The Letters and Journal of Brand Whitlock. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

Nye, Russel B. Midwestern Progressive Politics. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951.

Ohio Journal of Education, 1852-1855, 1910-1920.

Ohio's Progressive Sons. Cincinnati: Queen City Publishing Co., 1905

Perry, J. Hazard, and Warner, Mason. The Lincoln Club. Toledo: Warner and Perry, 1899.

Portrait and Biographical Record of the City of Toledo and Lucas County and Wood County, Ohio. Chicago: Chapman Publishing Co., 1895.

Progressive Men of Northern Ohio. Cleveland: Plain Dealer Publishing Co., 1906.

Scribner, Harvey. *Memoirs of Lucas County and the City of Toledo*. Vol. 1-2. Madison: Western Historical Association, 1910.

Stinchecombe, Jean L. *Reform and Reaction: City Politics in Toledo.* Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968.

Tager, Jack. *The Intellectual as Reformer: Brand Whitlock and the Progressive Movement*. Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve, 1968.

Tager, Jack. "Progressives, Conservatives, and the Theory of the Status Revolution." *Mid-America* 58 (July 1966): 162-75.

The Toledo Teacher, 1915-1919 (Toledo Public Library).

Toledo Und Sein Deutschtum. Cleveland: German-American Biographical Company, 1899.

Tsanoff, Stoyan V. *Educational Value of the Children's Playgrounds*. Philadelphia: Published for the Author, 1897.

Waggoner, Clark, ed. *History of the City of Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio*. New York: Munsell & Co., 1888.

Warner, Hoyt Landon. *Progressivism in Ohio, 1897-1917*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1964.

Whitlock, Brand. *Forty Years of It*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1914.

Winter, Nevin O. *A History of Northwest Ohio*. Vol. 1-3. Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1917.

Dissertations and Theses:

Bailey, Garl L. "The Toledo Independent Movement: A Test of the Urban Liberalism Thesis." Master's thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1977.

Bertha, Stephen J. "A History of Immigrant Groups in Toledo." Master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1945.

Brown, G. Maude. "A History of Organized Labor in Toledo." Master's thesis, University of Toledo, 1924.

Fenneberg, Doris Richings. "The Development of the American Playground As Illustrated in Toledo." Master's Thesis, University of Toledo, 1927.

Ford, Harvey S. "The Life and Times of Golden Rule Jones." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953.

Folk, Richard A. "A Study of the Socialist Party of Ohio, 1900-1925." Master's Thesis, University of Toledo, 1965.

Frederick, Peter Jerome. "European Influences on the Awakening of the American Social Conscience, 1884-1904." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California-Berkeley, 1966.

Glockner, Marvin Jay. "Assimilation of the Immigrant in the United States As Characterized by the Poles in Toledo." Master's Thesis, University of Toledo, 1966.

Hrivnyak, John M. "Birmingham: Toledo's Hungarian Community." Master's Thesis, University of Toledo, 1975.

Reese, William J. "William Backus Guitteau and Educational Reform in Toledo during the Progressive Era." Master's Thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1975.

Woloszyn, Andrew. "The Problem of the Poles in America as Illustrated by the Polish Community of Toledo." Master's Thesis, University of Toledo, 1927.

Manuscripts:

The following manuscript collections are located at the Toledo Public Library (TPL) and the Center for Archival Research (CAR) at Bowling Green State University. Both archives also contain Toledo School Reports, 1882-1911; these reports were not published annually but every several years.

Samuel M. Jones Papers (TPL)

William Backus Guitteau Papers (CAR)

Schools of Toledo Collection (TPL)

Toledo Board of Education Minutes, 1849-1920 (CAR)

Women's Educational Club Papers (TPL)

Newspapers:

The following newspapers are located at the University of Toledo (UT), Bowling Green State University (BGST), the Ohio Historical Library (OHL), the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW), and the University of Washington at Seattle (UWS).

The People's Call, 1894 (SHSW)

The Socialist, 1905-1906 (UWS)

Toledo Blade, 1848-1920 (BFSU, UT, OHL)

Toledo Evening Bee, 1890-1903 (UT, OHL)

Toledo News-Bee, 1904-1920 (UT, OHL)

Toledo Saturday Night, 1899 (SHSW)

The Toledo Union, 1897-1898 (SHSW)

Toledo Union Leader, 1907-1920 (SHSW, OHL)